17718

NATIONAL LIBRARY
OTTAWA

CANADA

BIBLIOTHÈQUE NATIONALE
OTTAWA

NAME OF AUTHOR... PATRICIA JOAN WAISMAN

TITLE OF THESIS... PERSONALITY, PERCEPTUAL STYLE AND CLOTHING USE

UNIVERSITY... UNIVERSITY of ALBERTA

DEGREE FOR WHICH THESIS WAS PRESENTED... M.Sc.

YEAR THIS DEGREE GRANTED... 1973

Permission is hereby granted to THE NATIONAL LIBRARY OF CANADA to microfilm this thesis and to lend or sell copies of the film.

The author reserves other publication rights, and neither the thesis nor extensive extracts from it may be printed or otherwise reproduced without the author's written permission.

(Signed) C Waisman

PERMANENT ADDRESS:
10503-78 St.
EDMONTON,
ALBERTA

DATED Sept. 14 1973

NL-91 (10-68)

THE UNIVERSITY OF ALBERTA

# PERSONALITY, PERCEPTUAL STYLE AND CLOTHING USE

by

© Patricia Joan Waisman

A THESIS

SUBMITTED TO THE FACULTY OF GRADUATE STUDIES AND RESEARCH

IN PARTIAL FULFILMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS FOR THE DEGREE

OF MASTER OF SCIENCE

IN

CLOTHING AND TEXTILES

SCHOOL OF HOUSEHOLD ECONOMICS

EDMONTON, ALBERTA

FALL, 1973

Leaf iii omitted

in page numbering.

ABSTRACT

Personality, Perceptual Style

and Clothing Use

by

Patricia Joan Waisman, Master of Science

University of Alberta, 1973

Major Professor: Dr. Anne Paule Kernaleguen
Division: Clothing and Textiles

The purpose of this study was to determine if a relationship exists among the variables of perceptual style, selected personality scales, and clothing usage factors.

Witkin's theory of field-dependence-independence provided the theoretical framework for this study. Dressing for self/others and interest in clothing, as well as specific personality scales were incorporated into the main theory. From the theoretical framework, it was hypothesized that individuals who dress for others would express a high interest in clothing, would be field-dependent, would be female, and would score high on the personality scales of dominance, sociability, self-acceptance, social presence, achievement via independence, intellectual efficiency, psychological-mindedness and flexibility.

The sample consisted of 80 university students, 41 males and 39 females, from the University of Alberta campus, March, 1973. The instruments used were: Witkin's Rod and Frame Test measuring

field-dependence; Gough's California Psychological Inventory measuring personality, and Waisman's Modified Clothing Consequence Scale measuring clothing usage. All tests were administered in one session by the researcher.

Pearson product-moment correlation and multiple linear regression analysis were computed. Results of the statistical analyses indicated that women and field-dependent persons tend to dress for others and have a high interest in clothing. Personality scales associated with these characteristics were high socialization, communality and femininity. Those who dress for self tended to be field-independent, to have a low interest in dress and were characterized by high capacity for status, high social presence, tolerance, intellectual efficiency and psychological-mindedness.

Results of the multiple regression analysis indicated that dominance best predicted dressing for self/others and that interest in clothing was best predicted by sex and psychological-mindedness.

On the basis of these findings the theoretical framework was supported, suggesting that a relationship exists among perception, personality and clothing use.

(80 pages)

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I wish to express sincere thanks to my Major Professor, Dr. Anne Kernaleguen. Her invaluable guidance and inspiration were given freely at all times, not only throughout this study but throughout my graduate school career.

The author also wishes to thank the other members of her examining committee: Dr. Verna Lefebvre, Miss Nelma Fetterman and Dr. Brendan Rule for their constructive discussion and encouragement.

The assistance of Shirley Presisniuk in typing the manuscript, and of Daniel Prett in statistical computation, are gratefully acknowledged as are the efforts of the students who took part in this study.

Special thanks is due to the author's husband, Ger, for his understanding and support.

TABLE OF CONTENTS


| CHAPTER | | PAGE |
|---|---|---|
| I. | INTRODUCTION | 1 |
| | Theoretical Framework | 1 |
| II. | RELATED RESEARCH | 5 |
| | Motives for Clothing-Oriented Behavior | 5 |
| | Clothing Interest and Personality | 6 |
| | Field-dependence and Personality | 9 |
| | Field-dependence and Sex Differences | 13 |
| | Summary | 14 |
| III. | METHODS | 15 |
| | Statement of the Problem | 15 |
| | Objectives | 16 |
| | Hypotheses | 16 |
| | Assumptions | 17 |
| | Definitions | 19 |
| IV. | PROCEDURE | 22 |
| | Data Collection Instruments | 22 |
| | California Psychological Inventory | 22 |
| | Rod and Frame Test | 25 |
| | Modified Clothing Consequence Scale | 26 |
| | Sample and Population | 28 |
| | Test Administration | 28 |
| | Analysis of Data | 29 |
| V. | FINDINGS | 30 |
| | General Information | 30 |

TABLE OF CONTENTS (Continued)


| CHAPTER | | PAGE |
|---|---|---|
| | Ranges, Means and Standard Deviations | 32 |
| | Comparison of Means and Standard Deviations with Norms | 32 |
| | T-Test | 36 |
| | Pearson Product-Moment Correlation | 36 |
| | Modified Clothing Consequence Scale | 36 |
| | California Psychological Inventory | 37 |
| | Rod and Frame Test | 41 |
| | Multiple Linear Regression Analysis | 43 |
| | Hypotheses and Results | 45 |
| VI. | INTERPRETATION | 48 |
| VII. | SUMMARY AND RECOMMENDATIONS | 56 |
| | Summary | 56 |
| | Recommendations | 58 |

***

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| LITERATURE CITED | | 62 |
| APPENDIXES | | 66 |
| Appendix A: | California Psychological Inventory Scale Descriptions | 67 |
| Appendix B: | Scoring Sheet and Conditions for Rod and Frame Test | 70 |
| Appendix C: | Modified Clothing Consequence Scale | 71 |
| Appendix D: | Results of Cluster Analysis for MCCS | 78 |
| Appendix E: | General Instructions | 79 |
| VITA | | 80 |

LIST OF TABLES


| Table | Description | Page |
|---|---|---|
| 1 | Directional rating of variables | 18 |
| 2 | Frequency and percentage distribution of 80 university students, 41 males and 39 females, by age, year in university and faculty | 31 |
| 3 | Ranges, means and standard deviations for all variables for university students (N=80) | 33 |
| 4 | Ranges, means and standard deviations for all variables for 41 males and 39 females | 34 |
| 5 | Comparison of means and standard deviations for male and female university students on California Psychological Inventory | 35 |
| 6 | Comparison of means and standard deviations for Rod and Frame Test for male and female university students | 36 |
| 7 | Intercorrelation matrix of the Modified Clothing Consequence Scale for 80 university students | 38 |
| 8 | Correlation between MCCS, general information and RFT for 80 university students | 38 |
| 9 | CPI correlated with MCCS for 80 university students | 39 |
| 10 | Correlation between CPI, general information and RFT for 80 university students | 42 |
| 11 | Multiple linear regression analysis for MCCS (dependent variables) and CPI, RFT and sex (independent variables) N=80 | 44 |
| 12 | Correlation of clothing usage factors with field-dependence and personality factors for 80 university students | 47 |

# CHAPTER I

# INTRODUCTION

The late 1940's marked a turning point in the field of clothing and textiles. At this time it was realized that an important area in this field was being overlooked: the study of social-psychological influences in clothing-oriented behavior. Most studies can best be termed exploratory as there is a dearth of empirical research in this relatively new area. What appears to be needed is the use of sound theories from older disciplines in the behavioral sciences to provide guidance in developing and testing hypotheses that will better define the field and aid in prediction of behavioral aspects in clothing.

An individual's behavior patterns are not inherent but are acquired. Man is born into a world where he lives, from birth to death, in constant interaction with the physical and social environment. It is through this interaction with the environment and through his resulting experiences that he matures. His behavior becomes modified into consistent responses; responses which contribute to ego enhancement and ego defense, and which are also representative of his overall pattern of adjustment in answer to the demands and expectations of the physical, and particularly, social environment.

## Theoretical Framework

> If human beings were not reacting to other human beings in social situations, then there would be no felt need for clothing beyond, perhaps, the protection it offers from cold. (Ryan, 1966, p. 2)

How sensitive and how dependent an individual is upon the social environment, how one perceives himself in a social manner, will determine how he will behave. Clothing may take on different meanings, depending upon an individual's mode of perceiving, which would reflect how dependent he is on the environment for support.

One of the leading theories of perception is Gestalt psychology. Its main contribution is that it brought "reality" into the foreground as an important element to be considered in psychological theory. To some extent the Gestalt formulations about perception were a reaction against the structural psychology of that time. The keynote of structural psychology was that all psychological organization was determined exclusively by the content of conscious states and past experience. In contrast, the Gestaltists emphasized the role of field factors: it is the structured, orderly world outside the individual that decides the organized constitution of his perceptual experiences.

More recent studies have shown that the individual's characteristic pattern of adjustment carries with it distinct and enduring "sets" that influence his manner of organizing the field. The individual is not a passive, unimpressionable recorder of the field but an active agent who selectively contributes to the act and outcome of perceiving. Since individuals perceive in certain distinct, stable and predictable ways due to the operation of personal "sets," it is necessary to modify the Gestalt theory of perception. The possibilities of individual variation in organizing perceptual experience are greater than that expected on the basis of field factors alone.

In Gestalt pyschology the structure of the field is investigated with inadequate regard for the perceiver. Personal factors are in fact important since they relate perception and adjustment. Inherent

is differential selectivity, the extent one adheres to the pattern of the prevailing field, and how one organizes a poorly structured field in a characteristic manner. (Witkin, 1954)

It is in Witkin's theory of perception that the subjectivity of structural psychology and the objectivity of Gestalt psychology are combined to explain perception. For, it is not the personal characteristics of the perceiver alone, nor the structure of the field alone, but both that produce organized perceptual experiences. In studying the act of perceiving we must consider the active, integrated, purposeful agent equipped with his own nature of coping and adjustment. What and how he perceives depends on his characteristic coping mechanisms together with his current motivations and the nature of the real world. In some cases field-derived factors dominate, as when environmental pressures become too strong; in other cases ego-derived factors determine the perceptual outcome. (Witkin, 1954)

Witkin's theory of field-dependence, "the body as perceived," categorizes individuals as to whether they are highly sensitive to stimuli from their bodies regardless of outside environmental stimuli (field-independent) or are highly sensitive to outside environmental stimuli (field-dependent). Psychological systems are open in the sense that they are in continuous interaction with the environment. With respect to the environment or "field," a high degree of differentiation implies a distinct separation of what is identified as belonging to the self and what is identified as external to the self where the self is experienced as having definite boundaries. Segregation of the self makes possible greater determination of functioning from within (field-independence). The behavior involved delineates a con-

tinuum with opposite tendencies in perceptual performance.

This theory states that perception is only one subsystem of the total psychological functioning or personality of an individual. Personality pertains to the mode in which one copes with and adapts to his environment which in turn determines his degree of social interaction. Because "...clothing serves a social function primarily..." (Ryan, 1966, p. 121), how dependent one is socially, or in terms of perception, how dependent one is on the environment for "support and guidance" would influence his use of clothing in relation to his need for social interaction.

## CHAPTER II

## RELATED RESEARCH

The following review of literature pertains to the relationships found to exist between clothing and personality; field-dependence is surveyed in a similar manner. Where studies were relevant to sex differences in these areas, they are also noted. [illegible]ter is organized under the following headings: motives for clothing-oriented behavior, clothing interest and personality, field-dependence and personality, field-dependence and sex differences, and summary.

### Motives for Clothing-Oriented Behavior

Many of the earlier studies in the area of clothing dealt with motives and their influence in clothing selection. Nystrom (1928) put forth the contention that apparel is one of the most potential means of gaining the respect and favor of other people.

Hurlock (1929) mailed a questionnaire on motivation in fashion to 1400 people ranging in age from 16 to 51 years. From the 452 (32.2%) questionnaires returned, clothing selection was found to be related to conformity, economy, modesty, and self-expression. Administering a questionnaire to a sample of 350 women, Barr (1934) found conformity to be the most diffused and significant motive in psychological decisions; however, the wish to achieve self-expression in dress appeared to be more important than the desire for expression of other personality traits. This finding received support in a more recent study by Alexander (1961), involving adult and high school men and women. The motive underlying the desire to feel well-dressed was the expression

of individuality or personality.

Evans (1964) found four motivational forces influencing a subject's clothing use:

1. To depend on and be like others
2. To be independent of and different from others
3. To compensate for blocking elsewhere
4. To be recognized by, and as superior to, others

## Clothing Interest and Personality

Machover (1949) and Ryan (1966) used projective techniques that emphasized clothing in drawing tests. Women who overclothed the figure, had a high interest in clothing, were more sociable and more motivated toward social approval and dependence on others. Those who underclothed the figure, were uninterested in clothing, were more introverted, depending on fantasy and not on others for adjustment.

Rosencranz (1949; 1962), Vener (1953), Katz and Lazarsfeld (1955) and Baumgartner (1961) all related a high interest in or concern for clothing with a high degree of social participation. Hicks' (1970) results indicated a significant difference between the rate of fashion acceptance by the socially-oriented individual and the individual with low social orientation. Those low in social orientation would experience little motivation to engage in behavior intended to gain the attention and approval of others. Ryan hypothesized that the more socially-oriented person has greater interest in anything related to people, clothing being one of these interests. (Ryan, 1966, p. 114)

Vener and Hoffer (1959) stated that by early adolescence the individual has already become conscious of the importance of clothing in social life.

> Interest in clothing and the felt need for clothing varies inversely with the general feeling of adequacy or self-confidence in the social situation. That is, the more secure the individual feels in the social situation the less importance he attaches to clothing and the less it will affect him.
> (Ryan, 1966, p. 126)

Using adolescent populations, Stepat (1949), Dickens (1944), Silverman (1945), and Ryan (1952-1954) found that an interest in clothing appears to symbolize poor adjustment, and individuals possibly participate more in an anxious desire for social approval, tending to be dependent upon and sensitive to others' opinions and feelings. The cues derived from clothing may well have more importance to some personalities than to others.

Creekmore (1963) hypothesized, on the basis of Maslow's (1954) theory of motivation, that there would be positive relationships among one's general values, basic needs, and clothing behavior. General values were measured by the Allport-Vernon-Lindzey test of values. Basic needs were measured by 56 statements in which the subject indicated to what degree she would do the same thing in that or a similar situation. The needs measured were those delineated by Maslow. Clothing behavior was measured by a 130 item clothing-interest inventory of 14 classifications. From a sample of 300 college women, it was found that the use of clothing as a status symbol was related to the need for self-esteem. Self-esteem was further related to the use of clothing as a tool to achieve the goals of the individual through social manipulation.

Pasnak (1968) found that 25 college women selected as fashion innovators enjoyed dressing just for the self alone and were positive in their feelings about using clothing to achieve desired goals. The innovators, in contrast to the non-innovators, were inner-directed,

reacting more to themselves than to others.

From a number of studies, Aiken (1963) took statements concerning clothing behavior and interest. A sample of 300 college students checked the statements as either true or false. Item intercorrelations grouped 33 statements into five "dress clusters" of similar items: decoration, comfort, interest, conformity, and economy. A group of 160 students from the original sample were given the new list of 33 statements with the California Psychological Inventory (CPI) and the Allport-Vernon-Lindzey values test (AVL). High "interest in dress" related to high scores in conventional, conscientious, stereotyped thinking and to a tendency to be persistent, tense, suspicious, and insecure. Those checking "conformity in dress" were conscientious, moral, sociable, traditional and submissive on the CPI test. These results may be biased in that the subjects tested were higher in religious values than the population as a whole.

In Eaglin's (1968) study of college girls, the high fashion preference group had the highest scores on the CPI scales of sociability, tolerance, self-control, intellectual efficiency, and achievement via conformity.

Until very recently, little research has been concerned with sex differences in clothing-oriented behavior. Alexander (1961) investigated the underlying motives to feel well-dressed for a mixed sample at various age levels. Men, particularly high school boys, stated that it is important to dress well because you are "judged by the way you look"; it creates a favorable impression on others. Self-confidence, a sense of well-being and a boost to morale were reasons given by college girls and adult women, but seldom mentioned by adult men.

Adult men alone stressed the need to be well-dressed because it was an indication of status.

## Field-dependence and Personality

> Evidence from subsequent studies in fact showed as we see later, that people with a relatively field-dependent way of perceiving have a less developed sense of their identity and of their separateness from others than do more field-independent perceivers. A self which is only limitedly segregated from the field-or which, in experience, easily "loses" itself in the field-is characteristic of people who tend to experience the body or any object as "fused" with its surroundings. If we think of the self as corresponding to a segment of experience, we may consider that greater or more limited articulation represents a common quality running through much of a person's experience. (Witkin, 1962, pp. 5-6)

Gordon (1953) used the Rod and Frame Test (RFT) to measure field-dependence and developed a modified Thurstone-type scale to test social dependence. Ten psychiatrists ordered adjectives and phrases along a dependence-independence continuum. A final scale included all items in which there was consistent agreement. This self-rating scale was found to be significantly related to measures of field-dependence on the RFT for normal subjects and neurotic patients, and has shown that "field-dependent persons tend both to view themselves, and to be viewed by others, as socially dependent." (Witkin, 1962, p. 142)

Crutchfield, et al. (1958), in a study with Army Air Force captains, found certain check list and Q-sort items were significantly related to the mode of field approach on the RFT. These were: (a) field-dependent - concerned with good impression, gregarious, affectionate, considerate, tactful; (b) intermediate - energetic, adventurous, social poise and presence, non-conforming; (c) moderately field-independent - demanding, effective leader, takes ascendant

role, manipulates people, self-reliant; (d) extremely field-independent - cold, distant with others, unaware of social stimulus value, concerned with philosophical problems, individualistic, strong. The field-dependent group generally depends upon others for "guidance and support," hence take an interest in securing the approval of those on whom they rely. The extreme field-independent group "impresses others with their lack of interest in people." (Witkin, 1962, pp. 143-44)

A further study by Crutchfield, et al. (1958), with a sample of Air Force captains, dealt with how well they were able to recall and recognize pictures of men with whom they had spent several days at the assessment center. The number of pictures correctly identified was significantly related to the degree of field-dependence. The more field-dependent the subject, the more faces he was able to remember. In other words, the more dependent the subject, the more he would focus on the human environment and the less oriented he was toward the physical environment.

In a factor-analytic study, Pemberton (1952) administered tests on Thurstone's flexibility-of-closure factor with the Thurstone Gottschaldt to college students. Results similar to Crutchfield, et al. were found. Field-independent individuals were more inclined to be "ambitious and persevering," "logical and theoretical." Field-dependent subjects were more inclined to be "dependent on the good opinion of others," socially outgoing and "systematic" (a need for tidiness, routine, and dependence upon superficial, rigid rules).

Bell (1955) confirmed her hypothesis based on Riesman's (1950) concept of other and inner-directed attitudes. In a sample of college students, field-dependent individuals tended toward being other-

directed (cooperative, with a need for security, group adjustment, social approval and contact with others); just as field-independent subjects tended to be inner-directed (independent of social restrictions, concerned with the self, with control, competence and striving for creative achievement).

Linton and Graham (1959) used an autokinetic situation which measured the amount one changed one's judgements to conform with those of a confederate; a Syllogism test, which measured the impairment in syllogistic reasoning as a function of conflict between the subject's attitudes and the logical conclusion, and three tests of field-dependence namely: RFT, EFT (Embedded Figures Test) and BAT (Body Adjustment Test). The results clearly showed that field-independent individuals actively planned in order that they could arrive at their own decisions, uninfluenced by others. In the case of the field-dependent subjects, conformity rather than an independent effort was the usual method of coping with a situation.

Gardner, Jackson and Messick (1960) focused on the relation between field-dependence as measured by the RFT and achievement as measured by the Edwards Personal Preference Schedule and established that a significant relationship existed, although the relationship did not hold for EFT scores. McClelland, et al (1953) reported that need-achievement was greater for women, but not for men, when a lose of acceptability was feared. However, need-achievement was greater for men, but not for women, when intellectual failure threatened. Wertheim and Mednick (1958) also found a significant correlation between need-achievement motivation as developed by McClelland et al. (1953) and perceptual field-dependence (EFT) for college students.

Witkin (1954) administered the Rorschach Test individually to a

college group of 52 men and 51 women. All protocols were conventionally scored and the Rorschach records of six field-dependent and six field-independent performers on the RFT and tiling-room-tilting-chair test were examined for striking differences. Rorschach scores were then developed, based on seven aspects of response, and divided into two main but not mutually exclusive groups: the coping group, involving Rorschach responses that reflect organizing ability, activity level and capacity for control of impulses, and the introspective group which reflects the inner life of the person, being related to self-awareness, fantasy and self-acceptance.

Analysis of the Rorschach scores among the field-dependent group demonstrated a high inadequacy in both the coping and introspective areas. Self-awareness and self-acceptance were lacking as was the capacity for action in relation to the external world. Witkin concluded that the prevailing field is accepted by such people because in the absence of self-directed, self-propelled activity they have no standard to rely on. It was also suggested that field-independence depends upon more than awareness of oneself or of one's body. Rather, the factors, that seem to be important in maintaining independence of the field are the ability to act, to assert oneself, to organize, to make use of relevant factors in the field, and to control disruptive forces in oneself in following a goal.

Using the same group of 52 men and 51 women, two sets of drawings, of a male and female figure, were obtained from each subject; the first set in a group situation, the second set in an individual setting. Results showed that field-dependence persons produce drawings reflecting a low evaluation of their bodies, infantile defenses

against anxiety, lack of self-assurance, passivity coupled with uncontrolled expression of hostility and difficulty in accepting an adult role. Field-independent persons produce drawings expressing a high degree of narcissistic investment in the body, sophisticated defenses against anxiety, self-assurance, identification with "desirable characteristics" of both sexes, strong drive and manipulative tendencies in controlling their drives.

## Field-dependence and Sex Differences

A consistent finding in the investigation of individual differences was the tendency for women to be more field-dependent than men. Female subjects take a more global field approach in their perceptual and intellectual functioning, whereas men are inclined to take an analytical approach. In general, women are more dependent on others, more concerned with people and the impressions they make than men. Women are more likely to depend on and adhere to external standards for a definition of their own judgements and attitudes, (Janis, et al. 1959; Feinberg, 1951; Crutchfield, 1955, 1957; Nakamura, 1958).

Kernaleguen (1973) investigated the clothing orientation of 56 college women and men selected on the basis of sex and extreme scores on the RFT. The sample consisted of four groups: field-dependent and field-independent women, field-dependent and field-independent men. The results confirmed previous studies in that women were more field-dependent than men. In dress, women sought praise and recognition whereas men tended to dress to avoid criticism and ridicule.

White (1970) and Larsen (1972), in similar but separate studies,

selected samples from deviant and non-deviant populations. It was found that those who conformed to normative appearance were more field-dependent as measured by the RFT. Furthermore, Larsen found that among deviant college men, the more field-independent individuals placed lower values on conformity, on being "socially correct," on recognition, on being able to "attract favorable notice," and on dependence, in contrast to non-deviant subjects.

## Summary

The research reviewed has been that of studies pertaining directly or indirectly to the theoretical framework. An investigation of related research suggests a correlation between clothing use, personality and perceptual style.

In clothing, two factors have repeatedly emerged as motives in clothing selection and use; these are a means of conformity and a means of self-expression. Furthermore, personality and clothing interest are also significantly related. Apparently through clothing a means of adjustment is available, particularly where adjustment is dependent on the human environment. The need for "guidance and support" from others is one dimension of field-dependence, a perceptual index which reflects degree of social dependence. Within all three areas: personality, perception and clothing use, a similar continuum is evident with dependence on self at one end and dependence on others at the opposite end.

# CHAPTER III

## METHODS

The topics which will be discussed in this chapter are: statement of the problem, objectives, hypotheses, assumptions, and definitions.

### Statement of the Problem

From the research reviewed, there is a need for studying personality, perception and clothing use as an aggregate of interacting components that decide an individual's eventual pattern of adjustment. The human personality with its values and needs determines one's perception of the physical and social environment. Ultimately, this perceptual frame of reference governs one's adaptive behavior to his environment. How an individual adjusts to the world around him may be reflected in his use of clothing. Clothing may be used to gain approval from others or as a means of self-expression. The extent to which a person uses clothing for one or the other of these reasons may depend on his particular needs and perceptions. People who are field-dependent tend to be characterized by a need for guidance and support from others, a need for continuous reference to external standards in developing and maintaining attitudes, sentiments, and judgements, and by a shifting self-view depending upon variations in social context. On the other hand, field-independent perceptual performance involves the ability to function with relatively little support from the environment, a capacity for initiating and organizing, and the power to struggle for mastery over social and other environmental factors. Consideration of individual variations in perception

and of the relation between a person's perception and his personality makes the basic problem one of how different people deal with the field in which they are operating and to which they must adjust. (Witkin, 1954)

## Objectives

1. To examine the relationships among the dependent variables, the clothing usage factors:
   - A. Dressing for self/others
     - subdivided into: importance placed on clothing
       dressing for others with a need for acceptance
       dressing for self with an awareness of others
   - B. General interest
     - subdivided into: awareness and enjoyment in clothing
       active involvement with clothing
2. To investigate the relationships among the independent variables: sex, selected personality factors and field-dependence.
3. To investigate the relationships among the dependent and independent variables, and the power of prediction of the dependent variables by the independent variables.

## Hypotheses

1. There will be a signficant correlation between sex and
   - (a) clothing usage factors
   - (b) field-dependence
   - (c) personality factors

   More specifically, it is expected that women will tend to be more field-dependent and express a higher interest in clothing than men.

2. There will be a significant correlation between clothing usage factors and

   (a) field-dependence

   (b) personality factors

More specifically, it is suggested that field-dependence will correlate significantly with dressing for self/others, dressing for others-acceptance and dressing for self-awareness of others in a positive direction, and with all other factors of clothing usage in a negative direction.

3. There will be a significant correlation between field-dependence and personality factors.

On the basis of the related research, it is predicted that high scores on field-dependence will be related to low scores on the scales of dominance, sociability, self-acceptance, social presence, achievement via independence, intellectual efficiency, psychological-mindedness and flexibility. Low scores on field-dependence (field-independence) will be related to low scores on the scales of good impression and femininity.

## Assumptions

1. Clothing usage can be adequately measured by a Likert-type scale in the form of a self-rating questionnaire.
2. The subjects for this study do possess the qualities being measured, and have answered honestly and sincerely.
3. The general information (sex, year in university, faculty and age) can be considered nominal data; all other variables (field-dependence, clothing usage and personality factors) can be considered ordinal data for purposes of analysis.

Table 1. Directional rating of variables

| Variables | Possible Range | High Score | Low Score |
|---|---|---|---|
| Rod and Frame Test | 0-28 | field-dependent | field-independent |
| Modified Clothing Consequence Scale | | | |
| Dressing for self/others | 24-120 | dressing for others | dressing for self |
| importance of dress | 15-75 | low importance | high importance |
| dressing for others-acceptance | 8-40 | high need for acceptance | low need for acceptance |
| dressing for self-awareness of others | 3-15 | high awareness of others | low awareness of others |
| General interest | 17-85 | low interest | high interest |
| interest-awareness and enjoyment | 9-45 | low awareness, enjoyment | high awareness, enjoyment |
| interest-active involvement | 4-20 | low activity involved | high activity involved |
| California Psychological Inventory | depends on scale | strong characteristics of the scale | weak or opposite characteristics of the scale |

## Definitions

The following terms are defined for reference within this study.

1. Use of Clothing - the basic function of clothing for the individual is as a means of social interaction[1] in terms of a Modified Clothing Consequence Scale[2] (MCCS); operationally defined as:

   A. dressing for self/others (Ds/o) - a continuum of clothing usage with dressing to please oneself at one end and dressing to seek approval of others at the opposite end.

   Subdivisions:

   1. importance of dress (I) - the degree to which an individual cares about clothing and to which he is sensitive to the use of clothing to please self or others.

   2. dressing for others-acceptance (Do-a) - the degree to which an individual dresses for others' approval, one reason being to fulfill a need for acceptance.

   3. dressing for self-awareness of others (Ds-a) - the degree to which an individual dresses to please himself but with an awareness of others' standards.

   B. general interest (GI) - the willingness to spend time, money and energy, to derive enjoyment, to experiment, and to notice and invest details in clothing with special meaning.

---

[1] Social Interaction - denotes the reciprocal influencing of the acts of persons and groups, usually mediated through communication. This definition includes the interaction of a person with himself. (Gould and Kolb, 1964)

[2] See Data Collection Instruments for development of test, p. 26.

Subdivisions:

1. interest-awareness and enjoyment (I-ae) - the amount of awareness and enjoyment experienced from having an interest in clothing.

2. interest-active involvement (I-ai) - the amount of activity entailed in having an interest in clothing.

2. Perceptual Style - expressed in terms of field-dependence, the mode of perception with respect to environmental field. The person with a more field-independent way of perceiving tends to experience his surroundings analytically, with objects experienced as discrete from their backgrounds. The person with a more field-dependent way of perceiving tends to experience his surroundings in a relatively global fashion, passively conforming to the influence of the prevailing field or context. (Witkin, 1962, p. 35) Operationally defined, field-dependence, as measured by the Rod and Frame Test (RFT), "evaluates the individual's perception of the position, in relation to the upright, of an item within a limited visual field." (Witkin, 1962, p. 36) The mean of the deviations, in twelve attempts to extract successfully the rod from the tilted frame through reference to body position in the RFT, is the score of field-dependence for each individual.

3. Personality - "...the dynamic organization within the individual of those psychological systems that determine his unique adjustments to his environment" (Allport, 1937, p. 48); operationally defined by the California Psychological Inventory (CPI). The aim of this test is to provide a comprehensive sur-

vey of an individual from a social interaction point of view. Raw scores for each subject will be derived from 18 standard scales.[3] (Gough, 1957)

[3] See Data Collection Instruments for a description of the scales, p. 23.

# CHAPTER IV

# PROCEDURE

Within this chapter, data collection instruments, sample and population, test administration and analysis of data are reviewed.

## Data Collection Instruments

The following information is needed to test the hypotheses:

(a) personality factors

(b) perceptual performance

(c) clothing use

The instruments selected to obtain these data were:

(a) California Psychological Inventory

(b) Rod and Frame Test

(c) Modified Clothing Consequence Scale

### California Psychological Inventory

The CPI was selected to determine the personality factors of the subjects. The test was developed for normal populations and designed to be largely self-administering. It consists of a test booklet with 480 items, yielding 18 scales designed to measure personality characteristics significant in everyday life and in social interaction.

> Each scale is intended to cover one important facet of interpersonal psychology, and the total set of 18 is intended to provide a comprehensive survey of an individual from this social interaction point of view. The scales are grouped into four categories, seeking to emphasize some of the psychological and psychometric clusterings which exist among them.
> (Gough, 1957, p. 5)

The scales are as follows:

Class I. Measures of Poise, Ascendency, and Self-Assurance

1. Dominance (Do) - To assess factors of leadership ability, dominance, persistence and social initiative.

2. Capacity for status (Cs) - To serve as an index of an individual's capacity for status (not his actual or achieved status).

3. Sociability (Sy) - To identify persons of outgoing, sociable, participative temperament.

4. Social presence (Sp) - To assess factors such as poise, spontaneity, and self-confidence in personal and social interaction.

5. Self-acceptance (Sa) - To assess factors such as sense of personal worth, self-acceptance, and capacity for independent thinking and action.

6. Sense of well-being (Wb) - To identify persons who minimize their worries and complaints, and who are relatively free from self-doubt and disillusionment.

Class II. Measures of Socialization, Maturity and Responsibility

7. Responsibility (Re) - To identify persons of conscientious, responsible, and dependable disposition and temperament.

8. Socialization (So) - To indicate the degree of social maturity, probity, and rectitude which the individual has attained.

9. Self-control (Sc) - To assess the degree and adequacy of self-regulation and self-control and freedom from impulsivity and self-centeredness.

10. Tolerance (To) - To identify persons with permissive, accepting and non-judgmental social beliefs and attitudes.

11. Good impression (Gi) - To identify persons capable of creating a favorable impression, and who are concerned about how others react to them.

12. Communality (Cm) - To indicate the degree to which an individual's reactions and responses correspond to the modal ("common") pattern established for the inventory.

Class III. Measures of Achievement Potential and Intellectual Efficiency

13. Achievement via conformance (Ac) - To identify those factors of interest and motivation which facilitate achievement in any setting where conformance is a positive behavior.

14. Achievement via independence (Ai) - To identify those factors of interest and motivation which facilitate achievement in any setting where autonomy and independence are positive behaviors.

15. Intellectual efficiency (Ie) - To indicate the degree of personal and intellectual efficiency which the individual has attained.

Class IV. Measures of Intellectual and Interest Modes

16. Psychological-mindedness (Py) - To measure the degree to which the individual is interested in, and responsive to, the inner needs, motives, and experiences of others.

17. Flexibility (Fx) - To indicate the degree of flexibility and adaptability of a person's thinking and social behavior.

18. Femininity (Fe) - To assess the masculinity or femininity of interests. (High scores indicate more feminine interests, low scores more masculine.)

(Gough, 1957, pp. 10-11)

Over the past ten years, the CPI has been administered to over 1,000,000 persons ranging in age from 12 to 70 and has been found to be meaningful and interpretable with these subjects. For various populations test-retest reliabilities for short term coefficients are reasonably high, ranging from .71 to .91, with a median of .83. (Hase and Goldberg, 1967, p. 236) The long term test-retest correlations are mostly in the range of .60 to .80 which indicates moderate stability over one year, even among adolescents. (Gough, 1969b, p. 19) Estimates of internal consistency by applying Kuder-Richardson Formula 21 to 3572 high school boys and 4056 high school girls gave coefficients

ranging from .22 to .94. (Megargee, 1972, p. 29)

Gough's approach to test construction emphasized the development of scales to predict socially relevant behavior patterns and therefore, the building and validation of the CPI has aimed at maximizing predictive and concurrent validity. Most of the scales were derived and cross-validated using large samples of high school and college students. While norms are available on various groups, the CPI is most applicable to students and young adults, not only because of larger sample sizes and therefore, more stable normative data, but also because the language and content of the items is more relevant to younger groups. (Megargee, 1972)

## Rod and Frame Test

The RFT consists of: a luminous square figure which may be tilted to the left or right. A luminous rod, pivoting at center, moves independently of the frame. The test is conducted in a darkened room and the luminous rod and frame, presented in tilted directions, are the only things confronting the subject.

"With the frame tilted, the subject is required to bring the rod to the position that he perceives as upright." (Witkin, 1954, p. 25) For successful performance, the subject must extract the rod from the tilted frame in reference to his body position. (Witkin, 1954)

The mean of the 12 deviations in 12 trials is computed for each subject. The higher the score, the greater the tendency toward field-dependence. Low scores indicate field-independent behavior tendencies.

The RFT has a satisfactorily high reliability. For an interval of three years, the test-retest correlations obtained were .84 for men

and .66 for women. (Witkin, 1962) Construct validity for the RFT has been established. (Witkin, 1954)

## Modified Clothing Consequence Scale

A clothing instrument, the Modified Clothing Consequence Scale, was developed specifically for this study. (Appendix C) Various clothing questionnaires were examined to provide statements. The two sections: dressing for self/others and general interest, are comprised mainly of original statements with several others taken, and/or modified, from the Pasnak Clothing Consequence Scale (1968). The statements from this scale are numbers: 2, 3, 7, 8, 9, 10, 13, 15, 20, 22, 24, 26, 28, 29, 31 and 40. Items 17 and 19 are taken from Douce's (1969) Questionnaire Measuring Perception of Clothing as a Factor in Role Interpretation.

Face validity for the scale was determined by having 30 university students and 9 university professors, in three consecutive groups, place the statements of the scale under the definition best explaining what they were expected to measure. All statements misplaced more than 40% of the time were eliminated. The definitions were reworded for better clarity after each groups' efforts. A questionnaire was made up of the statements found to have the greatest face validity. From this questionnaire, reliability was computed by means of a test-retest. Seventy-five first and second year clothing and textile students were given the clothing scale once and again two weeks later without being told that it was the same questionnaire. The reliability coefficient of the entire scale was .82 and on the subscale, dressing for self/others, .84 and on the subscale, general interest, .71.

A cluster analysis was then performed on these 150 questionnaires to determine if the 41 statements were measuring two separate subscales:

dressing for self/others and general interest. The results of this analysis yielded five clusters. Cluster 1, 3 and 4 were basically subunits of the subscale dressing for self/others; clusters 2 and 5 were mainly comprised of items taken from the subscale general interest.

The statements within each cluster were examined to determine what the unifying component was and what specifically was being measured. Within the subscale, dressing for self/others, cluster 1 appeared to measure the relative importance of clothing to the individual, the degree to which an individual "cared" about his dress; the degree to which he was indifferent to the use of dress to please self or to please others. This cluster will be termed importance of dress for further reference within this study. Cluster 3 measured dressing for others but with an underlying need for acceptance. For futher reference this cluster will be termed dressing for others-acceptance. Cluster 4 measured dressing for self, but with an awareness of others' reactions. This cluster will be termed dressing for self-awareness of others for future reference.

The clusters issuing from the general interest subscale appeared to measure a passive versus an active aspect. Cluster 2 appeared to measure the awareness and enjoyment derived from having an interest in clothing. This cluster will be referred to as interest-awareness and enjoyment for reference. Cluster 5 measured an action element. This cluster will be referred to as interest-active involvement.

Finally the clothing instrument was drafted into its final form retaining the original 41 statements used in the questionnaire developed earlier for face validity.

General information: sex, year in university, faculty and age,

were obtained from IBM computer answer sheets used with the CPI and MCCS scales.

## Sample and Population

The sample consisted of 80 university students, 41 males and 39 females, randomly selected from a population comprising all University of Alberta students listed in the 1972-73 Student Directory. The subjects were recruited on a voluntary basis by means of a telephone conversation:

> I am a graduate student at the University of Alberta completing my Master's degree and require subjects for psychological testing. The testing will take about one hour and a half of your time for which you will be paid two dollars. Is it possible for you to participate?

If the subject agreed to come in for testing an appointment was made. No further explanation about the testing was given at this time. It was found that of those subjects telephoned 15% refused to participate.

## Test Administration

Testing was undertaken the first two weeks of March, 1973. The California Psychological Inventory and the Modified Clothing Consequence Scale were administered in a group setting whereas the Rod and Frame Test was individually performed. All instruments were taken in one session and together required approximately 90 minutes of each subject's time. General instructions, to be read before beginning the testing, were given to each subject as they arrived. (Appendix E)

Upon completion of the testing, each subject was debriefed. Students were told that the purpose of the testing was "to investigate

the relationship between clothing use, perception and behavior," and that the results of the study would be posted in the building in September. Each subject was reassured that all tests taken were for normal populations, that there were no right or wrong answers, and that all individual scores would be kept strictly confidential.

## Analysis of the Data

### Descriptive

The ranges, mean scores, and standard deviations of all variables will be reported in tables, and, depending on availability, compared with established norms.

### Statistical

The Pearson Product-Moment Correlation Coefficient will be computed to test hypotheses 1, 2 and 3.

Multiple Linear Regression Analysis will be employed to determine which independent variables (sex, field-dependence and personality factors) best predict the dependent variables (clothing usage factors).

The level of significance for the statistical results will be as follows:

| | |
|---|---|
| $^{\circ}p < .10$ | approaching significance |
| $^{*}p < .05$ | significant |
| $^{**}p < .01$ | significant |
| $^{***}p < .001$ | highly significant |

# CHAPTER V

# FINDINGS

This chapter will present the descriptive and statistical analyses of the data collected through the administration of: Rod and Frame Test, California Psychological Inventory, Modified Clothing Consequence Scale and general information. Beginning with the descriptive analysis, the following will be discussed: (1) general information about the sample; (2) ranges, means, and standard deviations for all variables; (3) comparison of means and standard deviations with established norms and/or results obtained by other researchers. The statistical analysis will include: (1) results of the t-test; (2) results of the Pearson product-moment correlations; (3) results of the multiple linear regression analysis. The last section of this chapter will be devoted to the acceptance or rejection of hypotheses.

## General Information

The background characteristics investigated were: sex, age, year in university, and faculty. The frequency and percentage distribution of the above information is given in Table 2. Of the total sample of 80 students, 51.25% males and 48.75% females: 50% were within the ages of 17 and 19, 33.75% were 20 to 22 years of age, 12.5% were 23 to 25 years of age, 3.75% were 26 or older. The majority of subjects were in first year, 43.75%, with 27.5% in second year, 20% in third year, 6.25% in fourth year, and 2.5% in fifth year of university. The faculties to which the students belonged were: Science, 28.75%; Education, 18.75%; Arts, 15%; Engineering,

Table 2. Frequency and percentage distribution of 80 university students, 41 males and 39 females, by age, year in university, and faculty

| Characteristic | Frequency | | | Percent |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Males (N=41) | Females (N=39) | Total (N=80) | Total (N=80) |
| **Age** | | | | |
| 17-19 | 19 | 21 | 40 | 50.00% |
| 20-22 | 15 | 12 | 27 | 33.75% |
| 23-25 | 7 | 3 | 10 | 12.50% |
| 26 or older | 0 | 3 | 3 | 3.75% |
| Total | 41 | 39 | 80 | 100.00% |
| **Year** | | | | |
| First | 20 | 15 | 35 | 43.75% |
| Second | 9 | 13 | 22 | 27.50% |
| Third | 7 | 9 | 16 | 20.00% |
| Fourth | 3 | 2 | 5 | 6.25% |
| Fifth | 2 | 0 | 2 | 2.50% |
| Total | 41 | 39 | 80 | 100.00% |
| **Faculty** | | | | |
| Arts | 5 | 7 | 12 | 15.00% |
| Science | 15 | 8 | 23 | 28.75% |
| Education | 5 | 10 | 15 | 18.75% |
| Engineering | 8 | 0 | 8 | 10.00% |
| Business Commerce | 4 | 2 | 6 | 7.50% |
| Physical Education | 2 | 1 | 3 | 3.75% |
| Pharmacy | 0 | 3 | 3 | 3.75% |
| Household Economics | 0 | 3 | 3 | 3.75% |
| Nursing | 0 | 3 | 3 | 3.75% |
| Rehabilitation Medicine | 0 | 2 | 2 | 2.50% |
| Agriculture | 2 | 0 | 2 | 2.50% |
| Total | 41 | 39 | 80 | 100.00% |

10%; Business Commerce, 7.5%; Physical Education, Pharmacy, Household Economics and Nursing, each 3.75%; Rehabilitation Medicine and Agriculture, each 2.5%.

## Ranges, Means and Standard Deviations

The ranges, means and standard deviations are listed in Table 3 for Rod and Frame Test, California Psychological Inventory and Modified Clothing Consequence Scale for the total sample of 80 university students. Table 4 gives a breakdown of this same information for the 41 males and 39 females of this sample.

## Comparison of Means and Standard Deviations with Norms

Table 5 reports the means and standard deviations on scales for California Psychological Inventory, for males and females of this sample, and these are compared with norms established for male and female college students by Gough (1969b). The scales of social presence, psychological-mindedness, flexibility and femininity are higher for males in this study than the norms reported but, on all other scales Gough's norms for males are slightly higher. In the case of females however, the sample in this study was on the average 2.7 points lower on all scales except self-acceptance and femininity than female norms presented by Gough.

The mean and standard deviation for males on the RFT were compared with those of Peterson and Sweitzer (1973). Similarly, a comparison was made for female subjects using norms from studies done by Brett (1973) and White (1970). Table 6 reports these data. The mean and standard deviation of the Peterson and Sweitzer (1973) sample were higher than those for this study. This may be explained by the different procedure used. Peterson and Sweitzer had their subjects supported by thick foam pillows to decrease horizontal and vertical cues whereas the subjects in this study sat on a standard

Table 3. Ranges, means and standard deviations for all variables for university students (N=80)

| Variable | Range | Mean | Standard Deviation |
|---|---|---|---|
| RFT | 0.75-6.69 | 2.62 | 1.21 |
| CPI | | | |
| Dominance | 12-37 | 26.03 | 6.00 |
| Capacity for status | 11-28 | 18.51 | 3.62 |
| Sociability | 10-35 | 24.30 | 5.05 |
| Social presence | 22-52 | 36.71 | 5.97 |
| Self-acceptance | 12-30 | 21.44 | 3.83 |
| Sense of well-being | 21-44 | 34.30 | 5.06 |
| Responsibility | 16-38 | 28.25 | 4.70 |
| Socialization | 26-46 | 36.48 | 4.74 |
| Self-control | 8-43 | 26.30 | 7.84 |
| Tolerance | 7-31 | 20.79 | 5.23 |
| Good impression | 5-30 | 15.09 | 6.38 |
| Communality | 18-28 | 25.14 | 2.10 |
| Achievement via conformance | 13-35 | 25.23 | 4.76 |
| Achievement via independence | 8-28 | 20.53 | 4.55 |
| Intellectual efficiency | 27-47 | 37.71 | 5.03 |
| Psychological-mindedness | 4-16 | 10.98 | 3.01 |
| Flexibility | 3-21 | 11.54 | 4.13 |
| Femininity | 8-30 | 20.45 | 4.93 |
| MCCS | | | |
| Dressing for self/others | 47-103 | 70.84 | 9.45 |
| Importance of dress | 21-66 | 42.61 | 9.07 |
| Dressing for others - acceptance | 17-35 | 25.15 | 3.85 |
| Dressing for self-awareness | 3-13 | 8.30 | 2.13 |
| General interest | 24-64 | 46-96 | 9.20 |
| Interest-awareness and enjoyment | 12-39 | 27.20 | 6.17 |
| Interest-active involvement | 4-15 | 8.81 | 2.42 |

hardwood chair. A further discrepancy in procedure was the number of trials given in the RFT; Peterson and Sweitzer used 8 trials whereas the standard 12 trials were given for this study.

Table 4. Ranges, means and standard deviations for all variables for 41 males and 39 females

| Variables | Males | | | Females | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Range | Mean | S.D. | Range | Mean | S.D. |
| RFT | 0.75-4.52 | 2.06 | 0.84 | 0.94-6.69 | 3.22 | 1.26 |
| CPI | | | | | | |
| Dominance | 16-36 | 27.12 | 5.85 | 12-37 | 24.87 | 6.01 |
| Capacity for status | 12-28 | 18.85 | 3.60 | 11-24 | 18.15 | 3.65 |
| Sociability | 10-34 | 24.85 | 5.36 | 16-35 | 23.72 | 4.70 |
| Social presence | 23-52 | 38.12 | 5.97 | 22-46 | 35.23 | 5.66 |
| Self-acceptance | 12-30 | 21.56 | 4.14 | 14-28 | 21.31 | 3.52 |
| Sense of well-being | 21-44 | 34.20 | 5.12 | 21-42 | 34.41 | 5.06 |
| Responsibility | 16-37 | 27.83 | 4.53 | 18-38 | 28.69 | 4.90 |
| Socialization | 26-45 | 35.54 | 4.65 | 28-46 | 37.46 | 4.70 |
| Self-control | 8-43 | 25.29 | 7.82 | 9-43 | 27.36 | 7.82 |
| Tolerance | 11.30 | 21.00 | 4.76 | 7-31 | 20.56 | 5.74 |
| Good impression | 5-30 | 14.85 | 6.46 | 7-30 | 15.33 | 6.37 |
| Communality | 18-28 | 24.85 | 2.12 | 19-28 | 25.44 | 2.08 |
| Achievement via conformance | 13-35 | 25.00 | 5.10 | 17-34 | 25.46 | 4.44 |
| Achievement via independence | 14-28 | 20.85 | 4.16 | 8-27 | 20.18 | 4.96 |
| Intellectual efficiency | 27-47 | 38.20 | 5.09 | 27-47 | 37.12 | 4.98 |
| Psychological-mindedness | 4-15 | 11.54 | 2.63 | 5-16 | 10.39 | 3.30 |
| Flexibility | 3-21 | 12.12 | 4.23 | 3-20 | 10.92 | 3.98 |
| Femininity | 8-26 | 16.93 | 3.68 | 17-30 | 24.15 | 2.98 |
| MCCS | | | | | | |
| Dressing for self/others | 56-88 | 70.66 | 7.33 | 47-103 | 71.03 | 11.36 |
| Importance of clothing | 29-66 | 45.49 | 7.45 | 21-65 | 39.59 | 9.71 |
| Dressing for others-acceptance | 17-33 | 23.46 | 3.52 | 20-35 | 26.92 | 3.39 |
| Dressing for self-awareness of others | 3-11 | 7.76 | 1.84 | 3-13 | 8.87 | 2.29 |
| General interest | 32-64 | 51.32 | 7.39 | 24-57 | 42.39 | 8.75 |
| Interest-awareness and enjoyment | 20-39 | 29.61 | 5.10 | 12-35 | 24.67 | 6.23 |
| Interest-active involvement | 5-15 | 9.78 | 2.25 | 4-13 | 7.80 | 2.18 |

Table 5. Comparison of means and standard deviations for male and female university students on California Psychological Inventory

| Variable | Males (1973) N=41 | | Females (1973) N=39 | | Gough (1969b) Males N=1133 | | Gough (1969b) Females N=2120 | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Mean | S.D. | Mean | S.D. | Mean | S.D. | Mean | S.D. |
| Do | 27.1 | 5.8 | 24.9 | 6.0 | 28.3 | 6.3 | 28.5 | 5.9 |
| Cs | 18.9 | 3.6 | 18.2 | 3.7 | 20.9 | 3.8 | 22.2 | 3.6 |
| Sy | 24.9 | 5.4 | 23.7 | 4.7 | 25.4 | 5.0 | 26.0 | 4.8 |
| Sp | 38.1 | 6.0 | 35.2 | 5.7 | 37.3 | 5.8 | 37.0 | 5.9 |
| Sa | 21.6 | 4.1 | 21.3 | 3.5 | 22.3 | 3.8 | 19.5 | 8.1 |
| Wb | 34.2 | 5.1 | 34.4 | 5.1 | 36.6 | 4.6 | 37.5 | 4.4 |
| Re | 27.8 | 4.5 | 28.7 | 4.9 | 30.8 | 4.5 | 33.3 | 4.1 |
| So | 35.5 | 4.6 | 37.5 | 4.7 | 36.8 | 5.2 | 39.5 | 5.0 |
| Sc | 25.3 | 7.8 | 27.4 | 7.8 | 27.6 | 7.5 | 30.8 | 7.4 |
| To | 21.0 | 4.8 | 20.6 | 5.7 | 23.3 | 4.8 | 25.0 | 4.2 |
| Gi | 14.9 | 6.5 | 15.3 | 6.4 | 17.2 | 6.2 | 19.1 | 6.2 |
| Cm | 24.9 | 2.1 | 25.4 | 2.1 | 25.5 | 2.0 | 25.5 | 2.0 |
| Ac | 25.0 | 5.1 | 25.5 | 4.4 | 27.4 | 4.5 | 28.8 | 4.4 |
| Ai | 20.9 | 4.2 | 20.2 | 4.9 | 20.9 | 4.2 | 21.9 | 3.9 |
| Ie | 38.2 | 5.1 | 37.2 | 5.0 | 39.8 | 5.0 | 41.4 | 4.8 |
| Py | 11.5 | 2.6 | 10.4 | 3.3 | 11.4 | 3.0 | 11.4 | 2.9 |
| Fx | 12.1 | 4.2 | 10.9 | 4.0 | 11.1 | 3.8 | 11.6 | 3.7 |
| Fe | 16.9 | 3.7 | 24.2 | 3.0 | 16.7 | 3.7 | 22.8 | 3.3 |

The female subjects of this study had a considerably higher mean for field-dependence than the other three samples. The low mean of White's (1970) deviant female sample (deviancy judged on the basis of hemline) can be accounted for by the fact that only extreme subjects were used. On plausible explanation for the difference between the mean for females in this study and that of Brett's (1973a) may be the smaller sample size, the greater standard deviation, and the fact that the women scored higher on the CPI scale of femininity in this study (femininity found to be directly related to field-dependence).

Table 6. Comparison of means and standard deviations for Rod and Frame Test for male and female university students

| Sex | Group | | Mean | S.D. |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Male | Waisman (1973) N=41 | | 2.06 | 0.84 |
| | Peterson and Sweitzer (1973) N=20 | | 3.36 | 2.08 |
| Female | Waisman (1973) N=39 | | 3.22 | 1.26 |
| | Brett (1973) N=102 | | 2.58 | 1.14 |
| | White (1970) N=20 | Deviant | 1.74 | 1.34 |
| | | Non-deviant | 2.78 | 0.68 |

## T-Test

A pooled variance t-test was computed to determine if there was a significant difference between male and female subjects on the Rod and Frame Test. A t-value of -4.87 (78 df) yielded a two-tailed probability of 0.001, indicating that there was a highly significant difference dependent upon sex.

## Pearson Product-Moment Correlation

### Modified Clothing Consequence Scale

The first correlational analysis computed was an intercorrelation matrix of the Modified Clothing Consequence Scale. Through this method a better understanding of the scales was attained. Table 7 gives the results of this correlation. The subscale, dressing for self/others, correlated significantly with each cluster within its composition but did not correlate significantly with the subscale, general interest, or its two clusters. This suggests that dressing for self/others is a distinct unit from general interest within this test.

The variable, importance of dress, correlated negatively with the

variable, dressing for others with a need for acceptance, at the .05 level of significance and positively with the three interest variables at the .001 level of significance. Dressing for others-acceptance was signficantly related to dressing for self-awareness of others, general interest, interest in the form of awareness and enjoyment, and interest dependent upon activity at the .001 level of significance in each case. Dressing for self with an awareness of others correlated with general interest and interest in the form of awareness and enjoyment of clothing at the .01 level and with interest involving activity at the .05 level. The two factors of interest, awareness and enjoyment and active involvement, correlated at the .001 level of significance.

Table 8 reports the correlational analysis of Modified Clothing Consequence Scale with general information. There was no significant relationship found between age and year and any of the clothing variables. Sex was significantly related to dressing for others-acceptance in a positive direction at the .001 level, and to general interest, interest-awareness and enjoyment and interest-active involvement in a negative direction at the .001 level in each case. There was a negative correlation between sex and importance of dress at the .01 level and a positive relationship between sex and dressing for self-awareness of others at the .05 level.

California Psychological Inventory

The scales of the California Psychological Inventory were correlated with the variables of the Modified Clothing Consequence Scale, in Table 9. This table reports that dominance, capacity for status and sense of well-being correlated with the variables dressing

Table 7. Intercorrelation matrix of the Modified Clothing Consequence Scale for 80 university students

| Variables | I | Do-a | Ds-a | GI | I-ae | I-ai |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Dressing for self/others | +.79*** | +.35** | +.54*** | +.11 | +.06 | +.13 |
| Importance of dress | 1.00 | -.22* | +.10 | +.54*** | +.47*** | +.43*** |
| Dressing for others-acceptance | | 1.00 | +.46*** | -.50*** | -.48*** | -.44*** |
| Dressing for self-awareness | | | 1.00 | -.31** | -.33** | -.24* |
| General Interest | | | | 1.00 | +.96*** | +.72*** |
| Interest-awareness and enjoyment | | | | | 1.00 | +.58*** |
| Interest-active involvement | | | | | | 1.00 |

°p< .10 r=.185
*p< .05 r=.220
**p< .01 r=.287
***p< .001 r=.361

Table 8. Correlation between MCCS, general information and RFT for 80 university students

| Variables | Age | Year | Sex[1] | RFT |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Ds/o | -.19° | +.12 | +.02 | -.03 |
| I | -.13 | +.11 | -.33** | -.23* |
| Do-a | -.10 | +.02 | +.45*** | +.21° |
| Ds-a | -.08 | +.03 | +.26* | +.18 |
| GI | +.12 | +.02 | -.49*** | -.36*** |
| I-ae | +.14 | +.00 | -.40*** | -.40*** |
| I-ai | +.06 | +.08 | -.42*** | -.10 |

°p< .10 r=.185
*p< .05 r=.220
**p< .01 r=.287
***p< .001 r=.361

1 - indicates male; + indicates female

Table 9. CPI correlated with MCCS for 80 university students

| Variables | Ds/o | I | Do-a | Ds-a | GI | I-ae | I-ai |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Dominance | -.35** | -.18 | -.14 | -.49*** | +.03 | +.03 | +.04 |
| Capacity for status | -.28* | -.14 | -.19° | -.23* | -.04 | -.04 | -.10 |
| Sociability | -.21° | -.10 | -.12 | -.36*** | -.15 | -.18 | -.05 |
| Social presence | -.21° | +.03 | -.36*** | -.42*** | -.01 | -.03 | +.09 |
| Self-acceptance | -.03 | +.02 | -.09 | -.16 | -.08 | -.10 | +.06 |
| Sense of well-being | -.33** | -.18 | -.18 | -.35** | +.01 | +.03 | -.00 |
| Responsibility | -.28* | -.27* | +.04 | -.03 | +.03 | +.07 | -.13 |
| Socialization | -.04 | -.16 | +.23* | +.17 | -.01 | -.02 | -.08 |
| Self-control | -.20° | -.13 | -.09 | -.05 | +.07 | +.06 | -.01 |
| Tolerance | -.27* | -.06 | -.24* | -.26* | +.19° | +.16 | +.12 |
| Good impression | -.22* | -.14 | -.13 | -.10 | -.06 | -.08 | -.10 |
| Communality | +.08 | -.13 | +.29** | +.19° | -.28* | -.22* | -.24* |
| Achievement via conformance | -,17 | -.07 | -.09 | -.06 | -.09 | +.08 | -.03 |
| Achievement via independence | -.15 | +.11 | -.34** | -.25* | +.27* | +.25* | +.18 |
| Intellectual efficiency | -.31** | -.05 | -.34** | -.37*** | +.17 | +.15 | +.16 |
| Psychological-mindedness | -.19° | +.16 | -.46*** | -.44*** | +.42*** | +.41*** | +.30** |
| Flexibility | -.16 | +.07 | -.35** | -.26* | +.13 | +.13 | +.06 |
| Femininity | -.05 | -.39*** | +.39*** | +.37*** | -.41*** | -.34** | -.39*** |

°p < .10 r=.185
*p < .05 r=.220
**p < .01 r=.287
***p < .001 r=.361

for self/others and dressing for self-awareness of others in a negative direction in each case. Dressing for self/others correlated with dominance and with sense of well-being at the .01 level, and with capacity for status at the .05 level of significance. Dressing for self-awareness of others correlated with dominance at the .001 level, with capacity for status at the .05 level, and with sense of well-being at the .01 level. An inverse relationship was found between sociability and dressing for self-awareness of others, significant at the .001 level. Both at the .001 level, dressing for self-awareness of others and dressing for others-acceptance were negatively related to social presence. Responsibility was found to be associated with dressing for self/others (.05) and with importance of dress (.05) in a negative direction. Only dressing for others-acceptance correlated with socialization; a positive correlation at the .05 level of significance. There was a reciprocal relationship between tolerance and dressing for self/others, all at the .05 level of significance. Good impression was inversely related to dressing for self/others (.05). The degree of communality showed a positive relationship with dressing for others-acceptance (.01), and a negative relationship with general interest, interest-awareness and enjoyment, and interest-active involvement, significant at the .05 level in each case. The reverse was found true for achievement via independence. It correlated negatively with dressing for others-acceptance (.01) and with dressing for self-awareness of others (.05), but positively with general interest (.05) and with interest-awareness and enjoyment (.05). Intellectual efficiency was found to be inversely correlated with dressing for self/others (.01), dressing for others-acceptance (.01) and dressing for self-awareness of others (.001). A highly significant negative relation-

ship was found between psychological-mindedness and dressing for self-awareness of others (.001) and dressing for others-acceptance (.001). On the other hand, psychological-mindedness correlated positively with general interest and interest-awareness and enjoyment, at the .001 level in both cases, and with interest-active involvement at the .01 level of significance. Flexibility correlated only with the variables dressing for others-acceptance and dressing for self-awareness of others in a negative direction, at the .01 and .05 levels respectively. Femininity was related to all clothing variables except dressing for self/others at the .001 level of significance but for interest-awareness and enjoyment which was significant at the .01 level. Importance of dress and the three interest variables were negatively associated; the remaining two clothing variables were positively related to femininity. Three CPI scales were not found to be related to any of the clothing factors; these were self-acceptance, self-control and achievement via conformance.

General information and California Psychological Inventory were correlated and the results reported in Table 10. Age was positively related to sense of well-being and self-control, both at the .05 level of significance. Year in university did not correlate significantly with any of the personality scales. A negative correlation was found between sex and social presence at the .05 level. Sex was positively related to femininity at the .001 level of significance.

Rod and Frame Test

The association between the Rod and Frame Test and sex was $r = +.48$, (78df), significant at the .001 level. Table 8 has incorporated RFT with general information to provide correlations with the clothing variables. Field-dependence was negatively related to

Table 10. Correlation between CPI, general information and RFT for 80 university students

| Variables | Age | Year | Sex | RFT |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Dominance | +.04 | -.19° | -.19° | -.21° |
| Capacity for status | +.11 | -.09 | -.10 | -.08 |
| Sociability | -.05 | -.16 | -.11 | -.03 |
| Social presence | +.02 | -.07 | -.24* | -.09 |
| Self-acceptance | -.16 | -.14 | -.03 | -.18 |
| Sense of well-being | +.22* | +.02 | +.02 | +.04 |
| Responsibility | +.21° | -.03 | +.09 | +.06 |
| Socialization | -.03 | +.09 | +.20° | +.24* |
| Self-control | +.25* | +.21° | +.13 | +.17 |
| Tolerance | +.17 | +.15 | -.04 | +.03 |
| Good impression | +.20° | +.03 | +.04 | +.09 |
| Communality | -.04 | +.06 | +.14 | +.11 |
| Achievement via conformance | +.19° | +.06 | +.05 | +.06 |
| Achievement via independence | +.18 | +.21° | -.07 | -.01 |
| Intellectual efficiency | +.07 | +.09 | -.10 | .00 |
| Psychological-mindedness | +.02 | +.02 | -.20° | -.22* |
| Flexibility | -.04 | +.10 | -.15 | -.03 |
| Femininity | -.01 | +.06 | +.74*** | +.40*** |

| | |
|---|---|
| °$p \leq .10$ | r=.185 |
| *$p \leq .05$ | r=.220 |
| **$p \leq .01$ | r=.287 |
| ***$p \leq .001$ | r=.361 |

importance of dress at the .05 level of significance, to general interest, at the .001 level of significance, and to interest-awareness and enjoyment at the .001 level. From Table 10 results indicated a negative correlation between field-dependence and psychological-mindedness (.05). The RFT was positively associated with socialization and with femininity, at the .05 and .001 levels respectively.

The relationships that approached significance, at the .10 level, were not discussed but are reported in the tables and will be used in the interpretation which follows in the next chapter.

## Multiple Linear Regression Analysis

A multiple linear regression analysis was conducted to determine efficient prediction. The prediction of the dependent variables was accomplished by examining only those variables which significantly add to the prediction equation as decided by stepwise multiple regression. For the purposes of this study, clothing variables were considered to be dependent and sex, field-dependence and CPI scales were deemed independent variables. Table 11 shows the results of this analysis. The dependent variables, in each case, is predicted by a minimum number of independent variables such that no others make a significant addition to the prediction. Significance in this case is equal to, or greater than the .05 level.

The first dependent variable, dressing for self/others, was best predicted by dominance at the .01 level and secondly, by responsibility at the .05 level. Importance of dress was best predicted by femininity (.001) and by dominance (.05). Psychological-mindedness, then sex, and then achievement via independence were the best predictors of dressing for others-acceptance. Dressing for self-awareness of others was best predicted by dominance (.001), psychological-mindedness (.01), femininity (.05), capacity for status (.05) and sense of well-being (.05), in that order.

When looking at the interest variables, sex and psychological-mindedness consistently appeared to be the best two independent variables for prediction. General interest was best predicted by sex, at the .001 level and by sociability, flexibility, and achievement via independence respectively, all at the .05 level of significance.

Table 11. Multiple linear regression analysis for MCCS (dependent variables) and CPI, RFT and sex (independent variables) N=80

| Dependent Variables | Df | F | Independent variables that best predict the dependent variable | p |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Dressing for self/ others | 1,77 | 8.95 | Dominance | $p < .01$ |
| | | 4.97 | Responsibility | $p < .05$ |
| Importance of dress | 1,77 | 17.10 | Femininity | $p < .001$ |
| | | 6.41 | Dominance | $p < .05$ |
| Dressing for others- acceptance | 1,75 | 7.70 | Psychological-mind-edness | $p < .01$ |
| | | 15.26 | Sex | $p < .001$ |
| | | 5.35 | Achievement via independence | $p < .05$ |
| Dressing for self- awareness of others | 1,74 | 15.38 | Dominance | $p < .001$ |
| | | 9.52 | Psychological-mind-edness | $p < .01$ |
| | | 6.64 | Femininity | $p < .05$ |
| | | 6.53 | Capacity for status | $p < .05$ |
| | | 6.50 | Sense of well-being | $p < .05$ |
| General Interest | 1,72 | 25.33 | Sex | $p < .001$ |
| | | 16.08 | Psychological mind-edness | $p < .001$ |
| | | 6.07 | Sociability | $p < .05$ |
| | | 6.57 | Flexibility | $p < .05$ |
| | | 4.30 | Achievement via independence | $p < .05$ |
| Interest- awareness and enjoyment | 1,74 | 19.12 | Psychological-mind-edness | $p < .001$ |
| | | 7.69 | Sex | $p < .01$ |
| | | 13.22 | Sociability | $p < .001$ |
| Interest- active involvement | 1,76 | 14.28 | Sex | $p < .001$ |
| | | 9.63 | Psychological mind-edness | $p < .01$ |
| | | 6.47 | Capacity for status | $p < .01$ |

| | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| $F(1,77)=3.98$ | | $F(1,77)=7.01$ | | $F(1,77)=11.83$ | |
| $(1,76)=3.98$ | | $(1,76)=7.02$ | | $(1,76)=11.84$ | |
| $(1,75)=3.98$ | $p < .05$ | $(1,75)=7.02$ | $p < .01$ | $(1,75)=11.85$ | $p < .001$ |
| $(1,74)=3.98$ | | $(1,74)=7.02$ | | $(1,74)=11.86$ | |
| $(1,72)=3.98$ | | $(1,72)=7.03$ | | $(1,72)=11.88$ | |

The second variable of interest, interest-awareness and enjoyment, was best predicted by psychological-mindedness (.001), then by sex (.01), and finally by sociability (.01). Sex (.001), psychological-mindedness, and capacity for status (both at the .01 level) best predicted interest-active involvement.

## Hypotheses and Results

The hypotheses formulated, now stated in null form for purposes of statistical analysis, are as follows:

1. There will be no significant correlation between sex and
   (a) clothing usage factors
   (b) field-dependence
   (c) personality factors

No significant relationship was established between dressing for self/others and sex, but all other clothing variables did correlate significantly with sex. A significant positive relationship was found between sex and field-dependence. There were significant correlations between sex and the personality factors: social presence and femininity. Therefore Hypothesis 1(a) was rejected for all factors except dressing for self/others, Hypothesis 1(b) was rejected, and Hypothesis 1(c) was rejected except for the CPI scales: dominance, capacity for status, sociability, self-acceptance, sense of well-being, responsibility, socialization, self-control, psychological-mindedness, tolerance, good impression, communality, achievement via conformance, achievement via independence, intellectual efficiency and flexibility.

2. There will be no significant correlation between clothing usage factors and

(a) field-dependence

(b) personality factors

Table 12 shows the correlation of clothing usage factors with field-dependence and personality scales for the total sample. Only significant relationships are shown. From the findings, Hypothesis 2(a) was rejected for clothing usage factors: importance of dress, general interest, and interest-awareness and enjoyment, and accepted for factors: dressing for self/others, and interest-active involvement. Hypothesis 2(b) was rejected except for the personality factors: self-acceptance, self-control, and achievement via conformance; scales which did not correlate significantly with any clothing usage factors.

3. There will be no significant correlation between field-dependence and selected personality factors.

Field-dependence was found to correlate significantly with the CPI scales for socialization, psychological-mindedness and femininity. Therefore, Hypothesis 3 was rejected except for the personality factors: dominance, capacity for status, sociability, social presence, self-acceptance, sense of well-being, responsibility, self-control, tolerance, good impression, communality, achievement via conformance, achievement via independence, intellectual efficiency and flexibility.

Table 12. Correlation of clothing usage factors with field-dependence and personality factors for 80 university students

| Clothing Usage Factors | Dressing for self/ others | Importance of dress | Dressing for others-acceptance | Dressing for self-awareness of others | General Interest | Interest-awareness and enjoyment | Interest-active involvement |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Field-dependence and Personality factors** | | | | | | | |
| **Positively Related** | | | Fe | Fe | | | |
| | | | | | Py | Py | Py |
| | | | | | Ai | Ai | |
| | | | Cm | | | | |
| | | | So | | | | |
| **Negatively Related** | | Field-dependence | | | Field-dependence | Field-dependence | |
| | Do | | | Do | | | |
| | Cs | | | Cs | | | |
| | | | | Sy | | | |
| | | | Sp | Sp | | | |
| | Wb | | | Wb | | | |
| | Re | Re | | | | | |
| | To | | To | To | | | |
| | Gi | | | | | | |
| | | | | | Cm | Cm | Cm |
| | | | Ai | Ai | | | |
| | Ie | | Ie | Ie | | | |
| | | | Py | Py | | | |
| | | | Fx | Fx | | | |
| | | Fe | | | Fe | Fe | Fe |

## CHAPTER VI

## INTERPRETATION

The discussion which follows will consider the findings of this research, as well as that of other studies which may contribute to the interpretation, in light of the theoretical framework and the objectives delineated for this study.

The theoretical framework was based on Witkin's theory of field-dependence-independence and its relationship to personality and clothing use. Certain personality characteristics are associated with a person's perceptual performance. Theoretically, field-dependence denotes a dependence on the environment, particularly the social environment: a need for guidance, support and approval from others. Field-independence denotes a need for self-reliance; power to struggle for mastery over environmental forces. Clothing use appears to relate to Witkin's theory of field-dependence-independence. Empirical research has emphasized its social-psychological function. Depending upon a person's needs and perceptions, clothing may be one means of adjusting to the environment.

The first objective was to determine the relationships among the dependent variables, namely the clothing usage factors: dressing for self/others, with the subvariables of importance of dress, dressing for others with a need for acceptance, dressing for self with an awareness of others, and general interest with subvariables of interest-awareness and enjoyment, and interest-active involvement.

The statistical analysis indicated that low scores in dressing

for self/others, in other words, dressing for self, was related to high importance placed on clothing, to low need for dressing for others for acceptance, and to low awareness of others in dressing for the self. Dressing for self/others did not correlate significantly with the interest variables. On the other hand, dressing for self-awareness of others correlated significantly with all interest variables. This suggests that an individual dressing for self would not be concerned about others and their reactions; clothing would be important for the sake of pleasing self alone, however when others are influential, interest in dress attains significance.

A high importance placed on dress was associated with dressing for others-acceptance, and with high interest as measured by the three interest variables. It may be that a high interest was shown in clothing because, in this case, clothing was important to the individual and seen as one means of gaining the acceptance of others. This explanation is supported by the highly significant relationships found between dressing for others-acceptance and dressing for self-awareness of others and high interest in clothing. Again, it is concluded on the basis of these results that interest and awareness of and/or acceptance by others directly affect each other. This finding confirms the research of Ryan (1952-1954), Vener (1953), Rosencranz (1962) and Hicks (1970) which proposed that high interest in clothing was associated with high social orientation.

The interest factors correlated significantly among themselves suggesting that general interest usually is accompanied by a high degree of enjoyment, awareness and activity, and vice versa.

In fulfilling the second objective, the relationships among the independent variables, sex, selected personality factors and field-

dependence, were investigated. Women were found to be definitely more field-dependent than men. The majority of studies involving sex and field-dependence sustain this result. Witkin suggested:

> Our finding that women tend to be more field-dependent than men is certainly congruent with the difference in roles that men and women are pressed to assume during their development in our culture...whereas, in men, the acceptance of a dependent role carries with it a negative cultural stigma, in women passivity is often rewarded. (Witkin, 1954, p. 487)

The correlations between field-dependence and selected personality factors resulted in field-independence being significantly related to high psychological-mindedness and to approach significance with high dominance. High scorers in psychological-mindedness are characterized as: outgoing, spontaneous, quick, resourceful, changeable; verbally fluent and socially ascendant; rebellious toward rules, restrictions and constraints. High scorers in dominance are characterized as: aggressive, confident, outgoing, planful, having initiative; verbally fluent, self-reliant. These characteristics support the findings of Witkin. Witkin's correlations of perceptual-test-scores with the individual and total interview scores indicated a tendency for field-independent perceptual performers to show self-awareness; to express their impulses directly, to be active, to assert themselves, to organize, to make use of relevant factors in the field; to show self-assurance, to be less influenced by authority, tending to be guided by values, standards, needs of their own; and to deal with inferiority feelings in a compensatory manner. (Witkin, 1954)

Field-dependence was associated with high socialization and high femininity. High scorers in socialization are: honest, industrious, obliging, sincere, modest, steady, conscientious, and responsible;

self-denying and conforming. High scores in femininity are associated with: appreciation, patience, helpfulness, gentleness, moderation, perseverance, and sincerity; respect and acceptance of others; behaving in a conscientious and sympathetic way. The related research revealed that field-dependence was associated with a concern for good impression, with being affectionate, considerate, tactful, systematic, cooperative and with seeking the good opinion, approval and guidance of others. The theoretical framework is therefore supported by the data.

The findings from the relationships between sex and selected personality factors follow the tendencies previously stated between personality and field-dependence. Men tended to be more dominant, and to possess greater social presence and psychological-mindedness than women. Women, formerly found to be more field-dependent, scored higher on the scales of socialization and femininity than men.

Objective 3 entailed an investigation of the relationships among the dependent and independent variables, and the power of prediction of the dependent variables by the independent variables.

Beginning with the correlations of the clothing usage factors with the independent variables, the relationships between sex and clothing use showed that men had less interest and placed less importance on clothing when compared to the women of this sample. On the other hand, women dressed for others' acceptance and to a lesser degree, dressed for self with an awareness of others more so than men. Alexander's (1961) finding that adult men dressed to imply status was not substantiated in this study.

Ryan (1966) hypothesized that people more socially-oriented have

a greater interest in anything related to people, and clothing may be one of these interests. A field-dependent individual, considered socially-oriented, did express a high interest and importance in clothing and a tendency to dress for others for acceptance, giving support to this hypothesis.

Many significant relationships were found between clothing usage and personality. Dressing for others, from the subscale dressing for self/others, correlated with low scores in dominance, capacity for status, sense of well-being, tolerance, intellectual efficiency, responsibility and good impression. Sociability, social presence, self-control and psychological-mindedness approached significance with dressing for others. Of these, dressing for self with high awareness of others also correlated significantly with low scores in the first five scales mentioned and in sociability, social presence, achievement via independence, psychological-mindedness and flexibility, and with high scores in femininity. Dressing for self/others and dressing for self-awareness of others appear to be closely related in terms of personality characteristics. The fact that "others" are important may explain this connection. Low scores in dominance, capacity for status, sociability, social presence, and sense of well-being indicate a lack of poise, ascendancy and self-assurance. Low scores in intellectual efficiency indicate conventional and stereotyped thinking; lack of self-direction and self-discipline. Psychological-mindedness, when low, indicates a slow, deliberate tempo and an overly conforming and conventional character. From these definitions, both dressing for others and dressing for self with a high awareness of others typify field-dependent behavior and hence, confirm the expectations of this study.

Those individuals who scored high on importance of dress were also high in responsibility and femininity. Both personality scales tend to imply adherence to cultural norms. Responsibility, involving obligations and duties and being able to think and act reasonably, is defined in terms of the standards set by the society in which one lives. Clothing is generally more important to women than men in this culture, and in this case, women may place more importance on dress because it provides one means of meeting the expectations of the society.

Characteristics of those who dress for others but have a low need for acceptance also depict those of field-independent perceptual performers. Such individuals were found to have high social presence, high achievement via independence, high intellectual efficiency, psychological-mindedness, tolerance and flexibility. From these scales it appeared that they were self-reliant, often assertive and socially ascendent.

Low femininity, communality and socialization also represented those who dress for others with a low need for acceptance. Here such traits as being manipulative, guileful, deceitful, rebellious and given to excess in behavior, are expressed. Perhaps because there is no felt need to be accepted and therefore, be conscious of the reactions of others, the only thing constricting one's behaviour is oneself.

High interest consistently correlated with high communality and femininity and low psychological-mindedness for all three interest variables. Those with a high interest in clothing tended to be moderate, tactful, reliable, conscientious, helpful; overly conforming and con-

ventional; respectful and accepting of others-features similar to those who dress for others, who are highly aware of others and/or who have a high need to be accepted. A high interest shown in clothing may be the outcome of a need for others. Clothing may be one means of identifying with important reference groups and obtaining their guidance, approval and support. A high general interest and high interest-involving enjoyment and awareness correlated with low scores in achievement via independence. From these results the typical characteristics are: inhibited, anxious, cautious, dissatisfied, dull; submissive and compliant before authority; lacking self-insight and self-understanding. The need for others to give direction, and consequently, the high interest taken in clothing, possibly for identification with reference groups, may explain these relationships. Aiken (1963) also using the CPI, found similar results. High "interest in dress" was associated with persistent, tense, suspicious and insecure behavior and with conscientious, stereotyped thinking.

The final section of Objective 3, the independent variables that best predict the dependent variables, will now be discussed. Psychological-mindedness, the degree to which the individual is interested in, and responsive to, the inner needs, motives, and experiences of others, appears to be the best overall personality scale to predict significantly five of the seven clothing factors. Table 11 gives this data. As proposed by the related research, where there is a need for others one is very attentive to their reactions and clothing may become important as a visual cue. In examining the factor, dressing for self/others and its three subvariables, dominance and femininity were personality scales that effectively predicted their occurrence. Femininity appeared

to predict the importance attributed to dress, but dominance may be needed to allow the individual to dress for self. Within the interest variables, psychological-mindedness and sex were repeatedly the two best predictors of interest. Sociability emerged as an important predictor of general interest and of interest involving awareness and enjoyment, whereas capacity for status added to the prediction of the degree of interest manifested in active involvement in clothing. This may imply that a passive element accounted for sociability and interest, but that an active component in interest may be related to a capacity for status.

# CHAPTER VII

# SUMMARY AND RECOMMENDATIONS

## Summary

The purpose of this research was to investigate the clothing usage behavior of a sample of 80 university students, and to examine the perceptual performance and personality characteristics that are associated with this behavior.

The theoretical framework underlying this study is the view that clothing basically serves a social function and the adjustment of the individual to the environment involves the use of clothing in one form or another. Empirical research suggests a continuum, the use of clothing to please oneself at one end and the use of clothing to seek the approval of others at the opposite end. It is also proposed that interest is related to social orientation. Witkin's theory of field-dependence-independence also stresses the implications of adjustment to the environment but, in this case perception reflects the mode of adaptation. Field-dependent individuals appear to rely on others for guidance, approval and support, being highly socially dependent, whereas field-independent individuals are self-reliant, having little need for and interest in others. If personality is defined as the unique adjustments of an individual to the environment, then both clothing usage and perception must be reflected in personality characteristics.

The sample of 41 male and 39 female college students was selected randomly from the 1972-73 University of Alberta Students' Union Directory. Subjects were recruited voluntarily on the basis of a telephone con-

versation and were paid $2.00 each for their participation.

The instruments used in this study were: Witkin's Rod and Frame Test (measuring field-dependence), Gough's California Psychological Inventory (measuring personality), and Waisman's Modified Clothing Consequence Scale (measuring clothing usage). All instruments were administered by the researcher to each subject in one session during March, 1973. Descriptive analysis and statistical analyses, consisting of Pearson product-moment correlation and multiple linear regression, were done at the University of Alberta computer center.

Descriptive results indicated that the majority of subjects were between the ages of 17 and 22, were in first or second year of university, and were in the faculties of Science, Education, Arts and Engineering. Statistical results indicated that within the dependent variables, the clothing usage factors, sensitivity to others in clothing-oriented behavior related to a high interest in clothing and approached significance with field-dependent perceptual performance. In terms of sex, women were more field-dependent, placed more importance on and had a higher interest in clothing than men, and showed a higher need for using dress with an awareness of and acceptance by, others. It was found that individuals dressing for self tended to be high in the personality scales: dominance, capacity for status, sociability, social presence, sense of well-being, tolerance, intellectual efficiency, psychological-mindedness, self-control, responsibility, good impression, achievement via independence and flexibility, and low in the scales: socialization, communality and femininity in terms of dressing to please oneself, dressing for self with a low awareness of and need for acceptance by others. Those who placed a high importance on dress were also high

in responsibility and femininity. High interest in clothing correlated with low scores in achievement via independence, psychological-mindedness, and with high scores in communality and femininity. In keeping with the results previously delineated field-dependent perceptual performers and females tended to be lower in dominance, social presence and psychological-mindedness and higher in socialization and femininity than males.

Multiple linear regression was computed with the clothing usage factors as the dependent variables and sex, selected personality factors and field-dependence as the independent variables. The results indicated that interest in clothing was best predicted by sex and psychological-mindedness; the use of clothing to please self or for others was best predicted by dominance.

On the basis of this study, it is proposed that whenever other people are influential in a subject's use of clothing, the subject will show a high interest in and attribute a high importance to clothing and will tend to be field-dependent in his perceptual orientation. Personality scales associated with these characteristics are high socialization, communality and femininity. However, dressing for self was related to high scores in capacity for status, social presence, tolerance, intellectual efficiency and psychological-mindedness.

The findings of this study support the theoretical framework and it is therefore concluded that within this sample perception, personality and clothing use are related.

## Recommendations

The following recommendations for further research are made on the

basis of this study.

1. The theoretical framework, suggesting a relationship among personality, perception and clothing use, was supported; therefore, more research into this area could prove to be fruitful.

Perception, personality and clothing use appear to measure a similar entity and from this study it appears to be a form of social dependence. The evidence for this finding confirms the theory that clothing satisfies a social function primarily, both in terms of usage and interest. Whenever a sensitivity to others was found to influence clothing usage a high interest in dress generally followed.

2. Different theoretical frameworks using similar variables are needed to explore further the dimensions of the relationships found.

The theoretical framework forming the basis of this study stressed perception, more specifically field-dependence with its social implications. A similar concept, body-image, could be used as a theoretical framework wherein "feelings about the body" may give additional insight into clothing-oriented behavior and its social connotations.

There appears to be specific personality characteristics related to high scores in capacity for status, social presence, tolerance, intellectual efficiency and psychological-mindedness; characteristics that depict social poise and interpersonal effectiveness as well as independence of thought and action. (Megargee, 1972, p. 142) Various psychological tests may clarify such tendencies.

3. Repeated use of the clothing scale would aid in evaluating and refining the instrument.

Larger samples with various populations are needed to determine the limitations of the scale. Although the Modified Clothing Consequence

Scale was found to have a high test-retest reliability, different types of reliability should be computed. Validity, particularly construct validity, should also be calculated.

The cluster analysis resulted in some very significant findings and appears to categorize individuals fairly well. The questions need to be refined being originally drafted for two broad headings rather than five. Factor analysis to establish the relative independence of the factors derived from cluster analysis is also necessary.

4. The coherence between expressed clothing usage and actual behavioral manifestations should be investigated.

What is needed is a means of classifying clothing-oriented behavior manifestations. Such entities as fashion and conformity have been difficult to study because it is hard to categorize individuals on the basis of what they wear in terms of the criteria used. It appears that from previous studies the criteria used to group individuals on the basis of dress are inadequate. Furthermore, once individuals have been grouped their behavior, although similar, may be for different reasons. Another concern is whether a questionnaire, and in this case the MCCS, accurately confirms the actual behavior of the individual answering it.

5. Since it has been indicated that men and women differ in their use of clothing further study in this area would be informative.

In view of the changing sex roles in our society will differences in clothing interest and usage between the sexes persist? More work in this area is needed. Studies involving both men and women are uncommon in clothing.

In summary this study has attempted to obtain some broad classi-

fications to encompass the numerous variables within clothing and thereby attempt some unification within this area. Previously studies have measured clothing-oriented behavior but have failed to get at the underlying reasons for such behavior. Furthermore, there has been a lack of theory framing their research. In this research the theory that clothing serves a social purpose implies a breakdown within a social context. The support received for this theory appears to give direction for further investigation.

After reviewing related research two broad categories within clothing usage were chosen to explain such behavior. It is felt that whether one is independent socially and in terms of dress, dresses for self, or whether one is socially dependent and dresses for others, when combined with interest provided two broad categories that have given some indication of the "why" behind clothing usage.

## LITERATURE CITED

Aiken, L. 1963. The relationship of selected measures of personality in undergraduate women. Journal of Social Psychology 59:119-128.

Alexander, O. 1961. A pilot investigation of the motives underlying the desire to feel well-dressed at various age levels. Cornell University, Master's Thesis.

Allport, G. 1937. Personality-a psychological interpretation. Holt, Rinehart and Winston Inc., New York.

Barr, E. 1934. A psychological analysis of fashion motivation. Archives of Psychology. No. 171.

Baumgartner, C. 1961. Factors associated with clothing consumption among college freshmen. Ohio State University, Ph.D. Dissertation.

Bell, E. 1955. Inner-directed and other-directed attitudes. Yale University, Ph.D. Dissertation.

Brett, J. 1973. Fashion opinion leadership related to selected perceptual and personality variables. University of Alberta, Master's Thesis.

Brett, J. 1973a. In A. Kernaleguen. 1973. Specific dimensions of field-dependence. Unpublished paper.

Creekmore, A. 1963. Clothing behaviors and their relation to general values and to the striving for basic needs. Pennsylvania State University, Ph.D. Dissertation.

Crutchfield, R. 1955. Conformity and character. American Psychologist. 10:191-198.

Crutchfield, R. 1957. Personal and situational factors in conformity to group pressure. Paper read at 15th Int. Congr. Psychol., Brussels.

Crutchfield, R., D. Woodworth and R. Albrecht. 1958. Perceptual performance and the effective person. Lackland AFB, Texas, Personal Lab. Rep. WADC-TN-58-60. ASTIA Doc No. AD 151 039.

Dickens, D. 1944. Social participation as a criterion for determining scientific minimum standards in clothing. Rural Sociology. 9:341-349.

Douce, P. 1969. Selected aspects of personality related to social acceptance and clothing oriented variables. Utah State University,

Ph.D. Dissertation.

Eaglin, B. 1968. Relationship between certain personality traits and clothing style preferences. Illinois University, Master's Thesis.

Evans, S. 1954. Motivations underlying clothing selection and wearing. Journal of Home Economics 56:739-743. December.

Feinberg, I. 1951. Sex differences in resistance to group pressure Swarthmore College, Master's Thesis.

Gardner, R., D. Jackson, and S. Messick. 1960. Personality organization in cognitive controls and intellectual abilities. Psychological Issues 2 (Whole No. 8).

Gordon, B. 1953. An experimental study of dependence-independence in a social and laboratory setting. University of Southern California, Ph.D. Dissertation.

Gough, H. 1957. Manual for the california psychological inventory. (First ed.) Consulting Psychologists Press, Palo Alto.

Gough, H. 1969b. Manual for the california psychological inventory. (Rev. ed.) Consulting Psychologists Press, Palo Alto.

Gould, J. and W. Kolb (Eds.). 1964. A dictionary of the social sciences. The Free Press, New York.

Hase, H. and L. Goldberg. 1967. Comparative validity of different strategies of constructing personality scales. Psychological Bulletin 67:231-248.

Hicks, D. 1970. Fashion acceptance: relationship to social orientation and social class. Kansas State University, Master's Thesis.

Hurlock, E. 1929. The psychology of dress. The Ronald Press Co., New York.

Janis, I. et al. 1959. Personality and persuasibility. Yale University Press, New Haven, Conneticut.

Katz, E. and P. Lazarsfeld. 1955. Personal influence. The Free Press, Glencoe, Illinois.

Kernaleguen, A. 1973. Selected perceptual and personality variables related to orientations to clothing. Perceptual and Motor Skills 36:843-848.

Larsen, J. 1972. Comparison of deviant and non-deviant college men on selected perceptual and personality variables. Utah State University, Master's Thesis.

Linton, H. and E. Graham. 1959. Personality correlates of persuasibility. In I. Janis (Ed.). Personality and persuasibility. Yale University Press, New Haven, Conneticut.

Machover, K. 1949. Personality projection in the drawing of the human figure. Charles C. Thomas, Springfield, Illinois.

Maslow, A. 1954. Motivation and personality. Harper and Brothers, New York.

McClelland, D., J. Atkinson, R. Clark and E. Lowell. 1953. The achievement motive. Appleton Century Crofts, New York.

Megargee, E. 1972. The california psychological inventory handbook. Jossey-Bass Inc., San Francisco.

Nakamura, C. 1958. Conformity and problem solving. Journal of Abnormal Social Psychology 56:315-320.

Nystrom, P. 1928. Economics of fasion. The Ronald Press Co., New York.

Pasnak, M. 1968. Fashion innovators compared with non-innovators on clothing attitudes, self-actualization, and tolerance of ambiquity. Pennsylvania State University, Ph.D. Dissertation.

Pemberton, C. 1952. The closure factors related to temperament. Journal of Personality 21:159-175.

Peterson, J. and G. Sweitzer. 1973. Field-independent architecture students. Perceptual and Motor Skills 36:195-198.

Riesman, D. 1950. The lonely crowd. Yale University Press, New Haven, Conneticut.

Rosencranz, M. 1949. A Study of women's interest in clothing. Journal of Home Economics 41 (8): 460-462.

Rosencranz, M. 1962. Clothing symbolism. Journal of Home Economics 54:18-22.

Ryan, M. 1952-54. Psychological effects of clothing: part I, II, III and IV. Cornell Univ. Ag. Exper. Sta. Bull. 882, 898, 900 and 905.

Ryan, M. 1966. Clothing: a study in human behavior. Holt, Rinehart and Winston Inc., New York.

Silverman, S. 1945. Clothing and appearance, their psychological implications for teenage girls. Teacher's College, Columbia Univsity, New York. Contributions to Ed. No. 912.

Stepat, D. 1949. A study of clothing and appearance problems in relation to some aspects of personality and some cultural patterns in a group of college freshman girls. New York University, Ph.D. Dissertation.

Vener, A. 1953. Stratification aspects of clothing importance. Michigan State University, Master's Thesis.

Vener, A. and C. Hoffer. 1959. Adolescent orientations to clothing Technical Bulletin 270. Michigan State University, Ag. Exper. Sta. March.

Wertheim, J. and S. Mednick. 1958. The achievement motive and field independence. Journal of Consulting Psychology 22:38.

White, B. 1970. A comparison on selected perceptual and personality variables of college women, deviant and non-deviant in clothing appearance. Utah State University, Master's Thesis.

Witkin, H., H. Lewis, M. Hertzman, K. Machover, P. Meissner, and S. Wapner. 1954. Personality through perception. Harper, New York.

Witkin, H., R. Dyke, H. Faterson, K. Goodenough, and S. Karp. 1962. Psychological differentiation. John Wiley and Sons, Inc. New York.

# APPENDIXES

Appendix A:

California Psychological Inventory

# SCALE DESCRIPTIONS

## CLASS I. MEASURES OF POISE, ASCENDENCY, AND SELF-ASSURANCE

**1. Dominance**
**Do**

To assess factors of leadership ability, dominance, persistence, and social initiative. HIGH SCORERS: aggressive, confident, outgoing, planful, having initiative; verbally fluent, self-reliant. LOW SCORERS: retiring, inhibited, commonplace, indifferent, silent, slow in thought and action; avoiding situations of tension and decision; lacking in self-confidence.

**2. Capacity for status**
**Cs**

To serve as an index of an individual's capacity for status (not his actual or achieved status). The scale attempts to measure the personality qualities and attributes which underlie and lead to status. HIGH SCORERS: active, ambitious, forceful, insightful, resourceful, and versatile; ascendant and self-seeking; effective in communication; having personal scope and breadth of interests. LOW SCORERS: apathetic, shy, conventional, dull, simple, and slow; stereotyped in thinking; restricted in outlook and interests; uneasy and awkward in new or unfamiliar social situations.

**3. Sociability**
**Sy**

To identify persons of outgoing, sociable, participative temperament. HIGH SCORERS: confident, enterprising, ingenious, and outgoing; competitive and forward; original and fluent in thought. LOW SCORERS: awkward, conventional, quiet, submissive; detached and passive in attitude; suggestible and overly influenced by others' reactions and opinions.

**4. Social presence**
**Sp**

To assess factors such as poise, spontaneity, and self-confidence in personal and social interaction. HIGH SCORERS: clever, enthusiastic, imaginative, quick, informal, spontaneous, active, and vigorous; having an expressive, ebullient nature. LOW SCORERS: deliberate, moderate, patient, self-restrained, and simple; vaccillating and uncertain in decision; literal and unoriginal in thinking and judging.

**5. Self-acceptance**
**Sa**

To assess factors such as sense of personal worth, self-acceptance, and capacity for independent thinking and action. HIGH SCORERS: intelligent, outspoken, cool, versatile, witty, aggressive, and self-centered; possessing self-confidence and self-assurance. LOW SCORERS: methodical, conservative, dependable, conventional, easy-going and quiet; self-abasing and given to feelings of guilt and self-blame; passive in action and narrow in interests.

**6. Sense of well-being**
**Wb**

To identify persons who minimize their worries and complaints, and who are relatively free from self-doubt and disillusionment. HIGH SCORERS: ambitious, alert, and versatile; productive and active; valuing work and effort for its own sake. LOW SCORERS: unambitious, leisurely, cautious, apathetic, and conventional; self-defensive and apologetic; constricted in thought and action.

## CLASS II. MEASURES OF SOCIALIZATION, MATURITY, AND RESPONSIBILITY

**7. Responsibility**
**Re**

To identify persons of conscientious, responsible, and dependable disposition and temperament. HIGH SCORERS: responsible, thorough, progressive, capable, dignified, and independent; conscientious and dependable; alert to ethical and moral issues. LOW SCORERS: awkward, changeable, immature, moody, lazy, and disbelieving; influenced by personal bias, spite, and dogmatism; undercontrolled and impulsive in behavior.

**8. Socialization**
**So**

To indicate the degree of social maturity, probity, and rectitude which the individual has attained. HIGH SCORERS: honest, industrious, obliging, sincere, modest, steady, conscientious, and responsible; self-denying and conforming. LOW SCORERS: defensive, demanding, opinionated, resentful, headstrong, rebellious, and undependable; guileful and deceitful; given to excess, ostentation, and exhibition in behavior.

**9. Self-control**
**Sc**

To assess the degree and adequacy of self-regulation and self-control and freedom from impulsivity and self-centeredness. HIGH SCORERS: calm, patient, practical, self-approving, thoughtful and deliberate; strict and thorough in their own work and in their expectations for others; honest and conscientious. LOW SCORERS: impulsive, shrewd, excitable, irritable, self-centered, and uninhibited; aggressive and assertive; overemphasizing personal pleasure and self-gain.

**10. Tolerance**
**To**

To identify persons with permissive, accepting and non-judgmental social beliefs and attitudes. HIGH SCORERS: enterprising, informal, quick, tolerant, clear-thinking, resourceful; intellectually able; having broad and varied interests: LOW SCORERS: inhibited, aloof, wary and retiring; passive and overly judgmental in attitude; disbelieving and distrustful in personal and social outlook.

**11. Good impression**
**Gi**

To identify persons capable of creating a favorable impression, and who are concerned about how others react to them. HIGH SCORERS: cooperative, enterprising, outgoing, warm and helpful; diligent and persistent. LOW SCORERS: inhibited, shrewd, wary, and resentful; cool and distant in their relationships; self-centered and too little concerned with the needs and wants of others.

**12. Communality**
**Cm**

To indicate the degree to which an individual's reactions and responses correspond to the modal ("common") pattern established for the inventory. HIGH SCORERS: moderate, tactful, reliable, sincere, patient, steady, and realistic; honest and conscientious; having common sense and good judgment. LOW SCORERS: impatient, changeable, complicated, nervous, restless, and confused; guileful and deceitful; inattentive and forgetful; having internal conflicts.

CLASS III. MEASURES OF ACHIEVEMENT POTENTIAL AND INTELLECTUAL EFFICIENCY

**13. Achievement via conformance**
**Ac**

To identify those factors of interest and motivation which facilitate achievement in any setting where conformance is a positive behavior. HIGH SCORERS: capable, cooperative, organized, responsible, stable, and sincere; persistent and industrious; valuing intellectual activity and achievement. LOW SCORERS: coarse, stubborn, awkward, insecure, and opinionated; easily disorganized under stress or pressures to conform; pessimistic about their occupational futures.

**14. Achievement via independence**
**Ai**

To identify those factors of interest and motivation which facilitate achievement in any setting where autonomy and independence are positive behaviors. HIGH SCORERS: mature, forceful, dominant, demanding, and foresighted; independent and self-reliant; having superior intellectual ability and judgment. LOW SCORERS: inhibited, anxious, cautious, dissatisfied, dull; submissive and compliant before authority; lacking in self-insight and self-understanding.

**15. Intellectual efficiency**
**Ie**

To indicate the degree of personal and intellectual efficiency which the individual has attained. HIGH SCORERS: efficient, clear-thinking, intelligent, progressive, thorough, and resourceful; alert and well-informed; placing a high value on intellectual matters. LOW SCORERS: confused, cautious, easygoing, defensive, shallow, and unambitious; conventional and stereotyped in thinking; lacking in self-direction and self-discipline.

CLASS IV. MEASURES OF INTELLECTUAL AND INTEREST MODES

**16. Psychological-mindedness**
**Py** _____

To measure the degree to which the individual is interested in, and responsive to, the inner needs, motives, and experiences of others. HIGH SCORERS: outgoing, spontaneous, quick, resourceful, changeable; verbally fluent and socially ascendant; rebellious toward rules, restrictions, and constraints. LOW SCORERS: apathetic, serious, and unassuming; slow and deliberate in tempo; overly conforming and conventional.

**17. Flexibility**
**Fx** _____

To indicate the degree of flexibility and adaptability of a person's thinking and social behavior. HIGH SCORERS: insightful, informal, adventurous, humorous, rebellious, idealistic, assertive, and egotistic; sarcastic and cynical; concerned with personal pleasure and diversion. LOW SCORERS: deliberate, worrying, industrious, guarded, mannerly, methodical, and rigid; formal and pedantic in thought; deferential to authority, custom, and tradition.

**18. Femininity**
**Fe** _____

To assess the masculinity or femininity of interests. (High scores indicate more feminine interests, low scores more masculine.) HIGH SCORERS: appreciative, patient, helpful, gentle, moderate, persevering, and sincere; respectful and accepting of others; behaving in a conscientious and sympathetic way. LOW SCORERS: hardheaded, ambitious, masculine, active, robust, and restless; manipulative and opportunistic in dealing with others; blunt and direct in thinking and action; impatient with delay, indecision, and reflection.

## Appendix B:

## Scoring Sheet and Conditions for Rod and Frame Test

Number _____ Sex _____ Project _____

| Trials | Position of Frame | Position of Rod | Position of Rod Set by Subject |
|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | 28° Left | 28° Left | |
| 2 | 28° Left | 28° Right | |
| 3 | 28° Right | 28° Right | |
| 4 | 28° Right | 28° Left | |
| 5 | 28° Left | 28° Left | |
| 6 | 28° Left | 28° Right | |
| 7 | 28° Right | 28° Right | |
| 8 | 28° Right | 28° Left | |
| 9 | 28° Left | 28° Left | |
| 10 | 28° Left | 28° Right | |
| 11 | 28° Right | 28° Right | |
| 12 | 28° Right | 28° Left | |

Total _____

Mean _____

## Appendix C:

### MODIFIED CLOTHING CONSEQUENCE SCALE (MCCS)

### QUESTION BOOKLET

DIRECTIONS:

Choose one of the answers given after each statement that best expresses your feeling most of the time. There are no right or wrong answers.

On the answer sheet provided blacken the space of the answer you have selected with a pencil (ink cannot be scored mechanically). Make no marks on the test booklet.

PLEASE DO NOT LEAVE OUT ANY QUESTIONS.

Example 1. I will not wear garments that fit poorly.

| Strongly Agree | Agree | Neutral | Disagree | Strongly Disagree |
|---|---|---|---|---|

If your answer is Agree, then you will blacken out the space on the answer sheet that has "A" over it. Make your marks dark and between the guidelines as shown.

=S= =A= =N= =D= =SD=

1. I try to create a good impression by the way I dress.

| Strongly Agree | Agree | Neutral | Disagree | Strongly Disagree |
|---|---|---|---|---|

2. I enjoy attempting something new in clothing more than I enjoy wearing the old favorites.

| Strongly Agree | Agree | Neutral | Disagree | Strongly Disagree |
|---|---|---|---|---|

3. I believe a person should always strive to wear clothing which makes them as attractive as possible to others.

| Strongly Agree | Agree | Neutral | Disagree | Strongly Disagree |
|---|---|---|---|---|

4. I do not feel uncomfortable in the presence of others when I am wearing clothes that are different from what I usually wear.

| Strongly Agree | Agree | Neutral | Disagree | Strongly Disagree |
|---|---|---|---|---|

5. When I have a chance I will glance over or read advertisements for clothing in newspapers, pattern books and/or magazines.

| Strongly Agree | Agree | Neutral | Disagree | Strongly Disagree |
|---|---|---|---|---|

6. An individual should attempt to use his clothing to appear in a manner which is acceptable to others.

| Strongly Agree | Agree | Neutral | Disagree | Strongly Disagree |
|---|---|---|---|---|

7. I try to be alert to all new clothing ideas and possibilities.

| Strongly Agree | Agree | Neutral | Disagree | Strongly Disagree |
|---|---|---|---|---|

8. If you are concerned about what others think of your appearance, you should try to wear clothes which accent your good features.

| Strongly Agree | Agree | Neutral | Disagree | Strongly Disagree |
|---|---|---|---|---|

9. I feel slovenly if I am dressed sloppily when I am alone.

| Strongly Agree | Agree | Neutral | Disagree | Strongly Disagree |
|---|---|---|---|---|

10. Since wearing clothes which are pleasing to me personally gives me a good feeling, I try to dress well even when I will not be seen by others that day.

| Strongly Agree | Agree | Neutral | Disagree | Strongly Disagree |
|---|---|---|---|---|

11. Much of my time is spent on clothing - planning, buying, caring for, etc. in comparison to other students my age.

| Strongly Agree | Agree | Neutral | Disagree | Strongly Disagree |
|---|---|---|---|---|

12. My general interest in clothing is :

| SA very high | A above average | N average | D below average | SD very low |
|---|---|---|---|---|

13. In spite of the fact that I know no one else will see me, I feel better when I am dressed in designs that I consider becoming.

| Strongly Agree | Agree | Neutral | Disagree | Strongly Disagree |
|---|---|---|---|---|

14. I would rather wear something old but pleasing than something new.

| Strongly Agree | Agree | Neutral | Disagree | Strongly Disagree |
|---|---|---|---|---|

15. Even when no one else will see me, I prefer to wear flattering styles because they make me look and feel better.

| Strongly Agree | Agree | Neutral | Disagree | Strongly Disagree |
|---|---|---|---|---|

16. I often try several stores before buying a garment to get the best fit, style, and price.

| Strongly Agree | Agree | Neutral | Disagree | Strongly Disagree |
|---|---|---|---|---|

17. Sometimes when people stare at me curiously, I wonder if something is wrong with my clothing.

Strongly Agree Neutral Disagree Strongly Disagree

18. One of the first things I notice about a person is whether their clothing is fashionable.

Strongly Agree Neutral Disagree Strongly Disagree

19. I think in terms of how I dress as compared with others.

Strongly Agree Neutral Disagree Strongly Disagree

20. When I am alone, I could care less what I wear.

Strongly Agree Neutral Disagree Strongly Disagree

21. It is not worth the bother of spending alot of time dressing carefully when that time could be put to better use.

Strongly Agree Neutral Disagree Strongly Disagree

22. I am eager to try new clothing ideas.

Strongly Agree Neutral Disagree Strongly Disagree

23. I wear clothes when by myself that I would not wear if others were around.

Strongly Agree Neutral Disagree Strongly Disagree

24. Planning and wearing clothes are necessities which are seldom enjoyable.

Strongly Agree Neutral Disagree Strongly Disagree

25. I like to wear new clothes equally as much as I like to wear old favorites.

| Strongly Agree | Agree | Neutral | Disagree | Strongly Disagree |
|---|---|---|---|---|

26. When I am by myself, I do not get enough personal satisfaction from being dressed attractively to make it worth the effort.

| Strongly Agree | Agree | Neutral | Disagree | Strongly Disagree |
|---|---|---|---|---|

27. I am very conscious of the fit of garments.

| Strongly Agree | Agree | Neutral | Disagree | Strongly Disagree |
|---|---|---|---|---|

28. I think the stimulation of wearing something new makes it worthwhile to take a chance on something unusual and untried, no matter what others may think.

| Strongly Agree | Agree | Neutral | Disagree | Strongly Disagree |
|---|---|---|---|---|

29. I do not think it is worth the bother of spending time dressing-up just for myself alone.

| Strongly Agree | Agree | Neutral | Disagree | Strongly Disagree |
|---|---|---|---|---|

30. If I do not like a style which all my friends wear, I will not wear it even though I may be considered out of fashion.

| Strongly Agree | Agree | Neutral | Disagree | Strongly Disagree |
|---|---|---|---|---|

31. It is not worth the risk to experiment with untried clothing ideas.

| Strongly Agree | Agree | Neutral | Disagree | Strongly Disagree |
|---|---|---|---|---|

32. I wear "odds and ends" when I am not going to be seen by others because I do not think it is worthwhile to spend time or thought on dressing just for myself.

Strongly Agree | Agree | Neutral | Disagree | Strongly Disagree

33. I try to avoid making many changes in my clothing practices because changes make me uncertain of what others may think.

Strongly Agree | Agree | Neutral | Disagree | Strongly Disagree

34. When I meet someone I am immediately aware of their clothing.

Strongly Agree | Agree | Neutral | Disagree | Strongly Disagree

35. To be looked upon as having different taste in clothing only reassures my feeling of individuality. I dress to please myself.

Strongly Agree | Agree | Neutral | Disagree | Strongly Disagree

36. I enjoy wearing something different everyday by mixing and matching or achieving new looks with different accessories.

Strongly Agree | Agree | Neutral | Disagree | Strongly Disagree

37. Even if my friends do not like my clothes, but I do, I will still continue to wear them.

Strongly Agree | Agree | Neutral | Disagree | Strongly Disagree

38. Since different styles of clothes greatly change a person's appearance, I think it is worthwhile to experiment with the use of clothing.

Strongly Agree | Agree | Neutral | Disagree | Strongly Disagree

39. When by myself, I do not notice what I look like because it makes no difference whatever to me.

| Strongly Agree | Agree | Neutral | Disagree | Strongly Disagree |
|---|---|---|---|---|

40. If clothes please the wearer, then they should not be concerned about what other people think of their appearance.

| Strongly Agree | Agree | Neutral | Disagree | Strongly Disagree |
|---|---|---|---|---|

41. I try to express my individuality in the way I dress therefore I do not necessarily wear what everyone else does.

| Strongly Agree | Agree | Neutral | Disagree | Strongly Disagree |
|---|---|---|---|---|

## Appendix D:

## Results of Cluster Analysis for MCCS

Cluster 1, 3 and 4 were essentially subunits of the subscale dressing for self/others.

Cluster 1 includes statements: 26, 29, 32, 20, 39, 10, 15, 9, 13, 33, 35, 28, 41, 31 and 12 (31 and 12 were statements originally in the subscale general interest)

Cluster 3 includes statements: 1, 3, 6, 40, 8, 4, 19 and 27 (27 originally in general interest)

Cluster 4 includes statements: 23, 37, and 17.

Clusters 2 and 5 were mainly comprised of items taken from the subscale general interest.

Cluster 2 includes statements: 18, 34, 7, 22, 14, 2, 11, 36 and 21

Cluster 5 includes statements: 16, 38, 5 and 30 (30 originally in subscale dressing for self/others).

Statements 24 and 25 were not found to cluster within any group and therefore, were considered fillers whenever clusters were used for analysis.

## Appendix E: General Instructions

INSTRUCTIONS: TO BE READ BEFORE BEGINNING

We want to find out to what degree perception and behavior are related. There are no right or wrong answers for any part of this experiment; you are only required to answer in a manner that expresses your feelings most of the time.

All answers will be coded and therefore no names will be used in the analysis of the data; in this way all results will be anonymous and confidential.

You will be required to answer two written tests and participate in one experiment. Please do not leave before you have completed all three parts or your data will be useless. After doing the final portion of this experiment you will be paid for your time and cooperation.

---

PARTS ONE AND TWO: CALIFORNIA PSYCHOLOGICAL INVENTORY (CPI)
MODIFIED CLOTHING CONSEQUENCE SCALE (MCCS)

READ:
- Please read the directions before beginning the test
- Use only the pencils provided for completing the answer sheets
- Fill in your age, sex, ID number, faculty, etc. (For pages 2 and 3 of the CPI test your ID number is only necessary)
- Answer <u>all</u> questions, even if this means guessing; and make sure your pencil marks are dark and between the guidelines
- When completing the CPI test be sure your answer and question number are the <u>same</u>

PART THREE: EXPERIMENTAL TEST

APPROXIMATE TIME FOR EACH TEST:

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| | CPI | 1 hour |
| | MCCS | 15 minutes |
| (EXPERIMENTAL) | RFT | 15 minutes |
| | TOTAL | 1½ hours |

# VITA

Patricia Joan Waisman

Candidate for the Degree of

Master of Science

Thesis: Personality, Perceptual Style and Clothing Use

Major Field: Behavioral Science Aspects of Clothing and Textiles

Biographical Information:

Personal Data: Born in Drumheller, Alberta September 30, 1950; daughter of Olga A. and George T. Dwernychuk; married to Gerald A. Waisman, August 26, 1972.

Education: Attended elementary school in Edmonton, Alberta; graduated from Strathcona Composite High School in June, 1968; received Bachelor of Science degree in Household Economics Clothing and Textiles at University of Alberta, May 1971; completed requirements for Master of Science degree at University of Alberta in 1973.

Professional Experience: 1971-73, graduate teaching assistant at University of Alberta.